













THE  
**EDINBURGH REVIEW,**

OR  
*CRITICAL JOURNAL:*

FOR  
OCTOBER 1829 . . . . JANUARY 1830.

*TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.*

---

---

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.  
PUBLIUS SYRUS.

---

---

VOL. L.

**EDINBURGH:**

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE & CO.

FOR LONGMAN, REES, ORME, BROWN, AND GREEN, LONDON;  
AND ADAM BLACK, EDINBURGH.

---

1830.

052 EJI

Vol 50/pt 14

Overport Jefferson Public Library

Acq. No.

7770

Date

30.7

# CONTENTS OF No. XCIX.

	Page
<b>ART. I.</b> The Life of John Locke ; with Extracts from his Correspondence, Journals, and Common-Place Books. By Lord King . . . . .	1
<b>II.</b> 1. Records of Woman ; with other Poems. By Felicia Hemans.	
2. The Forest Sanctuary ; with other Poems. By Felicia Hemans . . . . .	32
<b>III.</b> 1. Enquête sur les Fers.	
2. Enquête sur les Sucres.	
3. De l'Enquête sur les Fers, et des Conditions du Bon Marché permanent des Fers en France, par J. J. Baude.	
4. De l'Enquête sur les Fers, par M. Anisson Dupéron.	
5. Mémoire sur le Tarif des Sucres, par les Raffineurs de Sucre de Paris.	
6. Observations Adressées à la Commission d'Enquête, par le Délégué de la Chambre de Commerce de Lyon.	
7. Mémoire à son Excellence le Ministre du Commerce, &c. par les Fabricans d'Etoffes de Soie de la Ville de Lyon.	
8. The Manufactures and Commerce of Lyons, translated from the French of Charles Dupin.	
9. Rapport de la Commission Libre, nommée par les Manufacturiers et Negocians de Paris, sur l'Enquête relative à l'état actuel de l'industrie du Coton en France.	
10. Situation de l'Industrie Cotonnière en France, en 1828, par M. Singer, ex-Negociant-manufacturier.	
11. Petition des Propriétaires de Vignes, du Département de la Gironde, Adressée aux Chambres, et Mémoire à l'Appui.	
12. Recherches Statistiques sur les Forêts de la France, par Faiseau Lavanne . . . . .	48
<b>IV.</b> Memoirs of Lady Fanshawe, Wife of the Right Honourable Sir Richard Fanshawe, Baronet, Ambassador from Charles the Second to the Court of Madrid in 1665. Written by Herself . . . . .	75

# CONTENTS.

	Page
V. Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ Byzantinæ. Editio emendatior et copiosior, consilio B. G. Niebuhrii instituta . . . . .	85
VI. Utilitarian Theory of Government, and the 'Great- 'est Happiness Principle' . . . . .	99
VII. Sermons and Tracts ; including Remarks on the Character and Writings of Milton, and of Fenelon ; and an Analysis of the Character of Napoleon Bonaparte. By W. E. Channing, D.D. of Boston, America . . . . .	125
VIII 1. L'agent immédiat du mouvement vital dévoilé, dans sa nature et dans son mode d'action, chez les Végétaux, &c. Par M. H. Dutrochet.	
2. Organographie Végétale, ou Description Raisonnée des Organes des Plantes. Par M. Aug. Pyr. De Candolle.	
3. Conversations on Vegetable Physiology, comprehending the Elements of Botany, with their Application to Agriculture. By the Author of 'Conversations on Chemistry,' &c. &c. . . . .	145
IX. Travels in Arabia ; comprehending an Account of those territories in Hedjaz which the Mahommedans regard as sacred. By the late John Lewis Burckhardt . . . . .	164
X. Library of Useful Knowledge. Farmer's Series.	181
XI. Cours de Philosophie. Par M. V. Cousin, Professeur de Philosophie à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris	194
XII. Narrative of an Ascent to the Summit of Mont Blanc, on the 8th and 9th August, 1827. By John Auldjo, Esq. of Trinity College, Cambridge	221
XIII. Lectures on Sculpture. By John Flaxman, Esq. R.A.	231
XIV. 1. Lärbok i Kemien. Af Dr J. Jac. Berzelius, Chemiæ Professor Vid Carolinska, Medico-Chirurgiska Instituteti Stockholm, &c.	
2. Elements of Practical Chemistry ; comprising a Series of Experiments in every Department of Chemistry, with Directions for performing them. By David Boswell Reid . . . . .	256
XV. A Letter addressed to the Earl of Aberdeen, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. By Henry Gally Knight, Esq. . . . .	277

# CONTENTS OF NO. C.

---

	Page
ART. I. 1. Lectures on the Philosophy of Modern History, delivered in the University of Dublin. By George Miller, D.D. M.R.I.A.	
2. Mahomedanism Unveiled: an Inquiry, in which that Arch-Heresy, its diffusion and continuance, are examined on a new principle, tending to confirm the Evidences, and aid the Propagation, of the Christian Faith. By the Rev. Charles Forster, B.D.	287
II. 1. The Speech of M. T. Sadler, Esq. M.P., on the State and Prospects of the Country, delivered at Whitby.	
2. Storia della Economia Pubblica in Italia, de Giuseppe Pecchio, . . . . .	344
III. Journal of a Passage from the Pacific to the Atlantic, crossing the Andes in the Northern Provinces of Peru, and descending the River Maranon, or Amazons. By Henry Lister Maw, Lieut. Royal Navy, . . . . .	363
IV. 1. Monumenti Etruschi, o di Etrusco nome, disegnati, incisi, illustrati e publicati dal Cavaliere Francesco Inghirami.	
2. Die Etrusker. Vier Bücher, von Karl Otfried Müller. (The Etruscans, in four books, by K. O. Müller; an Essay which obtained the Prize from the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin,) . . . . .	372
V. Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel Defoe: containing a Review of his Writings, and his Opinions upon a variety of important Matters, Civil and Ecclesiastical. By Walter Wilson, Esq. of the Inner Temple,	397
VI. Case of the Sugar Duties; with Proofs and Illustrations,	426



	Page
ART.VII. 1. Travels to and from Constantinople, in the Years 1827 and 1828; or Personal Narrative of a Journey from Vienna, through Hungary, Transylvania, Wallachia, Bulgaria, and Romelia, to Constantinople; and from that City to the Capital of Austria, by the Dardanelles, Tenedos, the Plains of Troy, Smyrna, Athens, Cyprus, Syria, Alexandria, Malta, Sicily, Italy, Istria, Carniola, and Styria. By Captain Charles Colville Frankland, R.N.	
2. Travels in Turkey, Egypt, Nubia, and Palestine, in 1824, 1825, 1826, and 1827. By R. R. Madden, Esq. M.R.C.S.	
3. Narrative of a Journey from Constantinople to England. By the Rev. R. Walsh, LL.D.	
4. Constantinople in 1828. A Residence of Sixteen Months in the Turkish Capital and Provinces; with an Account of the Present State of the Naval and Military Power, and of the Resources of the Ottoman Empire. By Charles Macfarlane, Esq.	437
VIII. Remarks on the Spirit Duties,	486
IX. A Dissertation on the Course and probable Termination of the Niger. By Lieut.-Gen. Sir Rufane Donkin, G.C.H. K.C.B. and F.R.S.	494
X. 1. Organon der Heilkunst von Samuel Hahnemann.	
2. Die chronischen Krankheiten, ihre eigenthümliche Natur und Homöopathische Heilung von Samuel Hahnemann.	
3. Reine Arzneimittellehre von Samuel Hahnemann,	504
XI. Sir Thomas More; or Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society. By Robert Southey, Esq. LL.D. Poet Laureate,	528
Index,	567

---

THE  
EDINBURGH REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1829.

---

---

No. XCIX.

---

---

ART. I.—*The Life of John Locke ; with Extracts from his Correspondence, Journals, and Common-Place Books.* By Lord KING. 4to, pp. 416. London, 1829.

THE appearance of a Life of Locke by the representative of his family, and that representative so distinguished a person as Lord King, is an event of more than ordinary importance in the world of letters. But this volume is of higher value than as a piece of biography, how ably soever it may be executed. The noble author has justly deemed it his duty to make his illustrious kinsman as much as possible his own historian ; and has given, from the stores of correspondence and unfinished works in his possession, a number of pieces, which, beside presenting in striking colours the habits of that great man, also throw much light upon the characters and the events of the times in which he lived.

It becomes, therefore, impossible to occupy this article with general observations upon the Life and Writings of Mr Locke. The work before us is important enough to demand especial attention upon itself, and not to be made the occasion of a dissertation upon its subject. That must be reserved for another opportunity ; which will doubtless be presented by some of the controversial tracts that are likely to arise out of the present publication.

John Locke was born at Wrington, in Somersetshire, in the year 1632, ten years before Sir Isaac Newton. His father was a man of moderate landed estate ; and had been injured by the Civil Wars, in which he served as a captain on the parliamentary side. After receiving his school education at Westminster,

Locke was sent to Oxford in 1651, and soon became distinguished among his fellow students of Christ Church for his learning, as well as natural abilities. But the philosophy of the Schools then retained entire dominion at Oxford; and he has been heard, in after life, to regret having consumed the most valuable time for study at that University, where, in those days, he could learn so little of what was really useful. Lord King, however, adds, that it is probable more has been made of these expressions than they deserved; for he justly observes, that he must have derived considerable benefit from the leisure there afforded for cultivating by himself other branches of learning, when he perceived the futility of the Scholastic; and he undoubtedly enjoyed at that place the society of able men, whose conversation led him to form the idea of his great work. That he held self-education to be by far the most important of any, and had experienced this in his own case, there can be no doubt. The following passages, from two letters to Lord Peterborough upon this subject, set it in a strong light:

‘In answer to a letter from the Earl of Peterborough, who had applied to him to recommend a tutor for his son, he says, “I must beg leave to own that I differ a little from your Lordship in what you propose; your Lordship would have a thorough scholar, and I think it not much matter whether he be any great scholar or no; if he but understand Latin well, and have a general scheme of the sciences, I think that enough; but I would have him well-bred, well-tempered; a man that, having been conversant with the world and amongst men, would have great application in observing the humour and genius of my lord your son; and omit nothing that might help to form his mind, and dispose him to virtue, knowledge, and industry. This I look upon as the great business of a tutor; this is putting life into his pupil, which when he has got, masters of all kinds are easily to be had; for when a young gentleman has got a relish of knowledge, the love and credit of doing well spurs him on; he will, with or without teachers, make great advances in whatever he has a mind to. Mr Newton learned his mathematics only of himself; and another friend of mine, Greek, (wherein he is very well skilled) without a master; though both these studies seem more to require the help of a tutor than almost any other.”—In a letter to the same person on the same subject, 1697, he says, “When a man has got an entrance into any of the sciences, it will be time then to depend on himself, and rely upon his own understanding, and exercise his own faculties, which is the only way to improvement and mastery.” After recommending the study of history, he farther says, “The great end of such histories as Livy, is to give an account of the actions of man as embodied in society, and so of the true foundation of politics; but the flourishings and decays of commonwealths depending not barely on the present time for what is done within themselves, but most commonly on remote and precedent constitution and events, and a train of concurrent actions amongst their neighbours as well as themselves; the order of time is absolutely necessary to a due know-

ledge and improvement of history, as the order of sentences in an author is necessary to be kept, to make any sense of what he says. With the reading of history, I think the study of morality should be joined; I mean not the ethics of the schools fitted to dispute, but such as Tully in his *Offices*, Puffendorf *de Officio Hominis et Civis*, *de Jure Naturali et Gentium*, and above all, what the *New Testament* teaches, wherein a man may learn to live, which is the business of ethics, and not how to define and dispute about names of virtues and vices. True politics I look on as a part of moral philosophy, which is nothing but the art of conducting men right in society, and supporting a community amongst its neighbours."

In 1660, when the Restoration had given rise to great controversies respecting the settlement of the church establishments, Locke appears to have written a tract on this subject, with the intention of printing it; but this he abandoned. It is, however, preserved, and is the earliest of his works that are extant. Lord King has given a few extracts from it, which are extremely interesting; for they show how great a leaning he then had towards the side of authority, and how much he was desirous of favouring concessions, upon matters not absolutely essential, for the sake of avoiding civil anarchy and religious discord. The excesses of those who had been the real friends of liberty, but who represented themselves as its only friends, seem to have alarmed him into somewhat too favourable an opinion of their antagonists. 'Since,' says he, 'I find that a general freedom is but a general bondage; that the popular assertors of public liberty are the greatest engrossers of it too, and not unfrequently called its keepers, I know not whether experience would not give us some reason to think, that were the part of freedom contented for indulged in England, it would prove only a liberty for contention, censure, and persecution.' He then says, that liberty, in his view, is 'not a liberty for ambitious men to pull down well-framed constitutions, that out of the ruins they may build themselves fortunes, nor a liberty to be Christians, so as not to be subjects; but that all he can wish for his country or himself is, to enjoy the protection of those laws which the prudence and providence of our ancestors established, and the happy return of his Majesty has restored.' The errors of such a man are to be treated with all tenderness, and respectfully to be pointed at for example's sake. Nothing, in truth, can be more natural, than to feel disgust at the extravagance, intolerance, and injustice of the men with whom you are agreed upon essentials. When you find them ready to persecute you, the moment they discover the least difference in your sentiments, it is almost unavoidable to call them 'the engrossers and keepers of liberty.' But the worst effect of their pretensions to infallibility, and the excesses to which it leads, is precisely, that it some-

times tempts honest and conscientious men to fall into the error of Locke, and betray a disinclination towards the cause itself, because its most forward supporters demean themselves unbearably. This feeling, we see, actually makes him speak the language of the opponents of the Restoration; and 'overlook,' as his noble biographer and kinsman justly remarks, 'those more lasting evils which have almost always attended the return of exiled monarchs.' Indeed, a short time only elapsed before he was made fully sensible of this. The High-Church party finding themselves strong in the new Parliament, all notion of comprehension was abandoned; and, with far more intolerance than had been shown by the Presbyterians themselves, differences in all matters, however trivial, were to operate an absolute exclusion. This change, in truth, prevented the publication of the tract, by rendering its object unavailing.

In 1665, he accompanied Sir Walter Vane, as secretary, on a mission to the Elector of Brandenburg; and some very excellent and entertaining letters from him to a friend, while upon this service, are given in this publication. On his return, he went back to Oxford, and refused two offers of diplomatic employment, in Germany and Spain, which were made to him at different times. He was also pressed by a friend, who had interest with the Duke of Ormond, then Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, to take orders, and accept of considerable preferment in the Irish church; and Lord King has given the letter in which, with a modesty only to be surpassed by the conscientious delicacy of his feelings, he declines this offer. Entirely agreeing with Lord King, that mankind have great reason to be thankful for the 'narrow escape' which he seems to have had of being a professional diplomatist, and disposed even to think it fortunate that the clerical profession did not divert any portion of his attention from his philosophical studies; we yet can by no means admit, that, had he obtained preferment in the church, he would never have attained the name 'of a great philosopher, who has extended the bounds of human knowledge.' There seems, indeed, to be nothing in the peculiar duties of a divine which should incapacitate for scientific pursuits; and the annals, both of the English and other churches, abound in examples of philosophy successfully cultivated by their ministers. In referring to what he deems the inevitable consequences of preferment in the Irish Church, it was difficult, one should have thought, for Lord King to forget the case of Bishop Berkeley.

In the year 1666 began, by an accident, Locke's acquaintance with the famous Anthony, first Earl of Shaftesbury. His Lordship had repaired to Oxford, with the intention of taking some

mineral water for an abscess in the chest, under which he then laboured; and the physician to whom he applied, being absent, had requested Locke to receive the distinguished visitor. Locke was profoundly versed in medical science, although he had not practised it professionally; and the charms of his conversation, in which wit, sense, and learning, were most happily blended, could hardly fail to make a deep impression upon a person of Shaftesbury's taste and discernment. Locke, in his turn, could not but be captivated by the brilliant qualities of a man, whose genius, and exemption from all vulgar corruption, were sufficient to gloss over the most turbulent ambition, and the greatest sacrifice of principle and consistency that were, perhaps, ever made for its gratification. At the time when Locke's friendship with him began, he had, after serving the Parliament in the Civil Wars, and being a zealous partisan of Cromwell during the Protectorate, devoted himself to the cause of the Restoration, and become a courtier of the prince from whom he derived his nobility. Locke now accompanied him from Oxford; and, having engaged him to submit to an operation which saved his life, such an intimacy grew up between them, that Locke was the inmate of Ashley House during a considerable part of every year, with the exception of three years, which he spent abroad; and he was consulted by Shaftesbury upon his most important private concerns. Lord King has given two curious letters of Shaftesbury—One upon political matters, in which he most positively denies his having had any hand in advising the profligate measure of shutting the Exchequer, which, indeed, is now generally admitted to have been Clifford's scheme; the other, on private and trifling subjects, but which shows the writer's playful manner. It is short, and we shall extract it.

‘MR LOCKE,

‘London, March 20, 79-80.

‘We long to see you here, and hope you have almost ended your travels. Somersetshire, no doubt, will perfect your breeding; after France and Oxford, you could not go to a more proper place. My wife finds you profit much there; for you have recovered your skill in Cheddar cheese, and for a demonstration have sent us one of the best we have seen. I thank you for your care about my grandchild, but having wearied myself with consideration every way, I resolve to have him in my house; I long to speak with you about it. For news we have little, only our government here are so truly zealous for the advancement of the Protestant religion, as it is established in the Church of England, that they are sending the Common Prayer-book the second time into Scotland. No doubt but my Lord Lauderdale knows it will agree with their present constitution; but surely he was much mistaken when he administered the covenant to England; but we shall see how the tripod and the holy altar will agree. My Lord of Ormond is said to be dying,

so that you have Irish and Scotch news; and for English, you make as much at Bristol as in any part of the kingdom. Thus, recommending you to the protection of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, (whose strong beer is the only spiritual thing any Somersetshire gentleman knows,) I rest, your very affectionate and assured friend,  
SHAFTESBURY.

The part of his time which he did not spend with Shaftesbury, was passed at Oxford; where, as early as 1670, he appears to have sketched the plan of his *Essay concerning Human Understanding*. Lord King seems to think, that this immortal work was completed in the following year; for he informs us, that 'the original copy, in Locke's own hand-writing, dated 1671, is still preserved.' This copy, however, must have left much to be added; for it was during his exile in Holland, as we learn from the unquestionable authority of Le Clerc, that Locke finished his *Essay*; the year 1687 being mentioned as that in which it was completed.

In the latter part of 1675, Locke went to reside in the South of France for the benefit of his health; and was happily absent during the disgraceful times of the Popish Plot. Although his pure and tolerant principles must, with all justly thinking men, for ever have exempted him from the least suspicion of encouraging Shaftesbury in the part he then took, even had he been living with him; yet is it fortunate for his fame, that the remote distance at which he was from those dismal scenes, deprives the most uncandid reasoner of every pretence for charging him with any share in them. He kept a very full and regular Journal of his travels from the day he landed at Calais; and one of the most curious and interesting parts of the volume before us is, the portion of his remarks on men and things, extracted from it by Lord King; nor are there any of these remarks more instructive, than those which convey to us an idea of that state of things under the old government of France, the loss of which is lamented by a certain class of politicians in this country,—while their brethren there are actually occupied in attempting to restore it. Thus, we find an estimate of the whole revenues of the church, which makes them amount to no less than twenty-four millions sterling a-year. The exemption of the lands of the nobility from taxes, as well as the ancient church lands, is another glory of the old system, which, doubtless, has in late times sadly faded away. The salt duty, or *Gabelle*, and the abuses of its farmers, as well as the cruelty of the laws relating to it, are thus noted:

'At Picais is made all the salt that is used in this part of France: the manner is this; a great square pond, divided into squares by little banks, with channels between each to bring in the salt water, which is raised

from the étang by wheels, with wooden buckets. They cover the squares or tables, as they call them, five or six inches deep; and when the sun has exhaled almost all the moisture, they supply it with more salt water, and so continue all the heat of the year; at the latter end, they have a cake of salt four or five inches thick, according to the heat and drought of the year. They that are owners of the soil, are at the charge of making the salt, and sell it to the farmers for five sous the minot; a measure of seven inches deep, and twenty-three and a half diameter, weighs one hundred and twenty pounds. The salt which the owner sells for five sous, the farmer sells again for sixteen livres. For this favour, they say the farmers give two millions a-year to the King, and are at as much more charge in officers and guards employed, keeping constantly in pay 18,000 men. The defrauding the duty of the commodity is of such consequence, that if a man should be taken with but an handful of salt not bought from the farmers, he would be sent to the galleys.'

This observation relates to Languedoc; the following to Tours:

'They gave the King this year 45,000 livres, to be excused from winter quarters, which came to one-tenth on the rent of their houses. Wine and wood that enter the town pay tax to the King; besides, he sends to the several companies of the trades for so much money as he thinks fit; the officer of each corps de mestier taxes every one according to his worth; which, perhaps, amounts to one écu, or four livres, a-man. But a bourgeois that lives in the town, if he have land in the country, and lets it, pays nothing; but the paisant who rents it, if he be worth any thing, pays for what he has, but he makes no defalcation of his rent. The manner of taxing the country is this: the tax to be paid being laid upon the parish, the collectors for the year assess every one of the inhabitants, according as they judge him worth, but consider not the land in the parish belonging to any living out of it; this is that which so grinds the paisant in France. The collectors make their rates usually with great inequality; there lies an appeal for the over-taxed, but I find not that the remedy is made much use of.'

The administration of justice keeps pace with the equity of the financial system. 'Many murders,' says the Journal, 'are committed here (Montpelier.) He that endeavoured to kill his sister in our house, had before killed a man, and it had cost his father five hundred écus to get him off;—*by their secret distribution*, gaining the favour of their Counsellors.'

The condition of the common people in France is to be gathered from such facts as the following:

'We rode abroad a league or two into the country westward, which they call Grave, from whence comes the Grave wine; all vineyard. Talking with a poor paisant, he told me he had three children; that he usually got seven sous a-day, finding himself, which was to maintain their family, five in number. His wife got three sous when she could get work, which was but seldom; other times the spinning, which was for



their cloth, yielded more money: out of these seven sous they five were to be maintained, and house-rent paid, and their taille, and Sundays, and holidays provided for: for their house, which, God wot! was a poor one room, one story, open to the tiles, without windows, and a little vineyard, which was as bad as nothing—(for though they made out of it four or five tiers of wine, three tiers make two hogsheads, yet the labour and cost about the vineyard, making the wine, and cost of the casks to put it in, being cast up, the profit of it was very little)—they paid twelve écus for rent, and for taille four livres, for which, not long since, the collector had taken their frying-pan and dishes, money not being ready: their ordinary food rye-bread and water; flesh seldom seasons their pots; they can make no distinction between flesh and fasting days, but when their money reaches to a more costly meal, they buy the inwards of some beast in the market, and then they feast themselves. In Xantonge, and several other parts of France, the *paisants* are much more miserable: the *paisants* who live in Grave they count to be flourishing.

At Versailles he saw the other extreme of French society, under the same happy dispensation. The Queen sat on one hand of Louis XIV., and Madame de Montespan, his Majesty's mistress, sat on the other, in the box at the Opera. She attended him, in like manner, at a hunting party. This monarch was, however, exceedingly punctual in his devotional exercises. 'At the King's levee,' says Mr Locke, 'which I saw this morning, there is nothing so remarkable as his great devotion, which is very exemplary; for as soon as ever he is dressed, he goes to his bedside, where he kneels down to his prayers, several priests kneeling by him, in which posture he continues for a pretty while, not being disturbed by the noise and buzz of the rest of the chamber, which is full of people standing and talking one to another.'

In the course of the *Journal* are introduced some dissertations of great value. The most entire and instructive of these is one upon *Study*, in which the hand of the great master appears throughout. The sagacity and plain strong sense of Locke—his freedom alike from all the trammels of prejudice, and from any approach to an affectation of originality; so that whoever weighs his remarks, feels thoroughly persuaded of his differing from received opinions, simply for the love of truth, and never for the sake of seeming wiser than other men—these form the distinguishing features of this piece, as of all the illustrious author's works; which attest, throughout, the strict justice of the description of himself which he directed to be engraved upon his tomb—'Literis innutritus, eousque tantum profecit ut veritati unicé studeret: hoc ex scriptis illius disce.'

In this discourse on *Study* he lays it down, that there are so many things to be known, while our time on earth is so short,

that we must at once reject all useless learning. The first parcel of lumber which he condemns to be flung overboard, is all that maze of words and phrases invented to instruct and amuse people in the art of disputing, and with which the logics, physics, and divinity of the Schools abound. 'Such words,' he says, 'no more improve the understanding than the move of a jack will fill our bellies.' Next he condemns the too great desire to know what have been other men's opinions. 'I do not say this,' he observes, 'to undervalue the light we receive from others, or to think there are not those who assist us mightily in our endeavours after knowledge; perhaps without books we should be as ignorant as the Indians, whose minds are as ill clad as their bodies: But I think it is an idle and useless thing to make it one's business to study what have been other men's sentiments in things where reason is only to be judge, on purpose to be furnished with them, and to be able to cite them on all occasions. However it be esteemed a great part of learning, yet to a man that considers how little time he has, and how much work to do, how many things he is to learn, how many doubts to clear in religion, how many rules to establish to himself in morality, how much pains to be taken with himself to master his unruly desires and passions, how to provide himself against a thousand cases and accidents that will happen, and an infinite deal more both in his general and particular calling; I say, to a man that considers this well, it will not seem much his business to acquaint himself designedly with the various conceits of men that are to be found in books even upon subjects of moment.' The third class of rejected studies consists of 'purity of language, a polished style, or exact criticism in foreign tongues. Under which head,' he says, 'Greek and Latin are to be comprehended, as well as French and Italian.' To spend much time upon such niceties, he considers only labouring for an outside, a handsome dress of truth and falsehood, which may become fashionable gentlemen, rather than wise and useful men. But from this prohibition he specially excepts whatever philological learning may tend towards the understanding of the Scriptures. Another head of excluded studies comprises all 'nice questions and remote useless speculations, as, where the earthly paradise was—what kind of bodies we shall have at the resurrection,' &c. The remarks upon useless Historical study we shall extract, as very important:

—'Antiquity and history, as far as they are designed only to furnish us with story and talk. For the stories of Alexander and Cæsar, no farther than they instruct us in the art of living well, and furnish us with observations of wisdom and prudence, are not one jot to be preferred to the

history of Robin Hood, or the Seven Wise Masters. I do not deny but history is very useful, and very instructive of human life; but if it be studied only for the reputation of being an historian, it is a very empty thing; and he that can tell all the particulars of Herodotus and Plutarch, Curtius and Livy, without making any other use of them, may be an ignorant man with a good memory, and, with all his pains, hath only filled his head with Christmas tales. And, which is worse, the greatest part of history being made up of wars and conquest, and their style, especially the Romans, speaking of valour as the chief if not the only virtue, we are in danger to be misled by the general current and business of history, and looking on Alexander and Cæsar, and such like heroes, as the highest instances of human greatness, because they each of them caused the death of several 100,000 men, and the ruin of a much greater number, overrun a great part of the earth, and killed the inhabitants to possess themselves of their countries—we are apt to make butchery and rapine the chief marks and very essence of human greatness. And if civil history be a great deal of it, and to many readers, thus useless, curious and difficult enquiries in antiquity are much more so; as the exact dimensions of the Colossus, or figure of the Capitol, the ceremonies of the Greek and Roman marriages, or who it was that first coined money; these, I confess, set a man well off in the world, especially amongst the learned, but set him very little on his way.

The rest of the discourse is extremely well worthy of attentive consideration. Among the lesser pieces, which come in under different dates of the Journal, the most curious is one upon Religion, in which Tillotson's famous argument upon the doctrine of the real presence—perverted, by the ingenious sophistry of Hume, into an argument against the possibility of miracles—is very clearly anticipated. He begins by affirming, that the being and attributes of God can only be discovered and judged of by natural reason. Any other source of knowledge can only be inspiration; but even this cannot, he says, be admitted by any one who receives it, much less by any other to whom he tells it, as the ground of believing what is so supernaturally communicated, except in as far as it is conformable to reason; which alone can enable either the one person or the other to distinguish between inspiration and fancy, or delusion. Again, he holds it impossible that God should have made a creature to whom the knowledge of himself was necessary, and yet only imparted that knowledge by the channel through which all manner of errors come into the mind—‘a channel much more likely to let in falsehoods than truths, since nobody can doubt, from the contradictions and strangeness of opinions concerning God and religion in this world, that men are likely to have more frenzies than inspirations.’ He next proceeds to enquire how far inspiration can enforce any opinion concerning God or his religion, when ac-

accompanied with a power to do a miracle. And here again, says he, 'the last determination must be that of reason.'

'1st. Because reason must be the judge what is a miracle and what not; which, not knowing how far the power of natural causes do extend themselves, and what strange effects they may produce, is very hard to determine.

'2d. It will always be as great a miracle, that God should alter the course of natural things to overturn the principles of knowledge and understanding in a man, by setting up any thing to be received by him as a truth, which his reason cannot assent to, as the miracle itself; and so at best, it will be but one miracle against another, and the greater still on reason's side; it being harder to believe that God should alter, and put out of its ordinary course some phenomenon of the great world for once, and make things act contrary to their ordinary rule, purposely that the mind of man might do so always afterwards, than that this is some fallacy or natural effect of which he knows not the cause, let it look never so strange.

'3d. Because man does not know whether there be not several sorts of creatures above him, and between him and the Supreme, amongst which there may be some that have the power to produce in Nature such extraordinary effects as we call miracles, and may have the will to do it, for other reasons than the confirmation of truth; for the magicians of Egypt turned their rods into serpents as well as Moses; and since so great a miracle as that was done in opposition to the true God, and the revelation sent by him, what miracle can have certainty and assurance greater than that of a man's reason?

'And if inspiration have so much the disadvantage of reason in the man himself who is inspired, it has much more so in him who receives the revelation only by tradition from another, and that too very remote in time and place.

'I do not hereby deny in the least that God can do, or hath done, miracles for the confirmation of truth; but I only say, that we cannot think he should do them to enforce doctrines or notions of himself, or any worship of him not conformable to reason, or that we can receive such for truth for the miracle's sake: and even in those books which have the greatest proof of revelation from God, and the attestation of miracles to confirm their being so, the miracles are to be judged by the doctrine, and not the doctrine by the miracles, v. Deut. xiii. i. Matt. xiv. 24. And St Paul says, "If an angel from heaven should teach any other doctrine," &c. &c.'

The following remarks upon religious enthusiasm are a continuation of the same argument; and doubtless derive the greatest weight from the admitted fact, that they are the sentiments of one of the most sincere and devout advocates that ever espoused the cause of Christianity.

'A strong and firm persuasion of any proposition relating to religion, for which a man hath either no or not sufficient proofs from reason, but receives them as truths wrought in the mind extraordinarily by influence

coming immediately from God himself, seems to me to be enthusiasm; which can be no evidence or ground of assurance at all, nor can by any means be taken for knowledge. If such groundless thoughts as these, concerning ordinary matters, and not religion, possess the mind strongly, we call it raving, and every one thinks it a degree of madness; but in religion, men, accustomed to the thoughts of revelation, make a greater allowance to it, though indeed it be a more dangerous madness: But men are apt to think in religion they may, and ought, to quit their reason.

‘I find that the Christians, Mahometans, and Bralimins, all pretend to this immediate inspiration; but it is certain that contradictions and falsehoods cannot come from God; nor can any one that is of the true religion, be assured of any thing by a way whereof those of a false religion may be, and are equally confirmed in theirs. For the Turkish dervishes pretend to revelations, ecstasies, visions, raptures, to be transported with illumination of God. v. Ricaut. The Jaugis, amongst the Hindoos, talk of being illuminated, and entirely united to God, v. Bernier, as well as the most spiritualized Christians.’

The remarks concerning Miracles bear date Sept. 1681; and must, consequently, have been written considerably before the publication of Tillotson’s celebrated discourse against Transubstantiation, which was about the end of Charles the Second’s reign. We find Mr Locke, a few years before, accidentally coming near one of the greatest discoveries in physical science, that of fixed air, which a century later changed the whole face of Chemistry.

‘M. Toinard produced a large bottle of muscat; it was clear when he set it on the table, but when he had drawn out the stopper, a multitude of little bubbles arose, and swelled the wine above the mouth of the bottle. It comes from this, that the air which was included and disseminated in the liquor, had liberty to expand itself, and so to become visible, and being much lighter than the liquor, to mount with great quickness. Q. Whether this be air new generated, or whether the springy particles of air in the fruits out of which these fermenting liquors are drawn, have by the artifice of Nature been pressed close together, and there by other particles fastened and held so; and whether fermentation does not loose these bonds, and give them liberty to expand themselves again? Take a bottle of fermenting liquor, and tie a bladder on the mouth. Q. How much new air will it produce? whether this has the quality of common air?’

Locke’s return to England was hastened by Shaftesbury, who had been taken into the ministry, and was now President of the Council, which the King had appointed, with the view of promoting conciliation. This measure, and the introduction of popular leaders into place, was adopted on the advice of Sir W. Temple; but Lord King leaves it to be inferred that the whole arrangement had his concurrence; whereas he certainly protested so vehemently against Shaftesbury’s admission, and deemed it so capital an error, that he himself tells us, it made him rather

desire the whole plan should miscarry, than be executed with such an addition.\* Lord King is also incorrect in representing Shaftesbury's resignation as voluntary, and, like Lord Russell's, the consequence of the King's proroguing the new parliament, chosen after he had dissolved the short one which succeeded the pensioned parliament, and passed the first exclusion bill, and the Habeas Corpus Act. Shaftesbury was deprived of his place as President of the Council by the King, about the same time that he made the Duke of Monmouth retire to Holland, in consequence of the intrigues of Essex and Halifax, and of the Duke of York's coming over, at their suggestion, on the King's illness. This is the account given of the transaction by Temple; and Hume, though he makes Shaftesbury's removal take place at the date of the King's proroguing the new parliament, yet is so far accurate, that he does not describe him as resigning, but dismissed. Burnet (vol. ii. p. 477) gives nearly the same account with Temple.

Locke arrived in England in May 1679, about a fortnight after the new Council was formed; and was, it may be presumed, living in his usual habits of intercourse with Shaftesbury, during that remarkable session when the Exclusion and Habeas Corpus bills were powerfully supported by his talents and zeal. But the asthma, with which Locke was afflicted, obliged him to pass the greater part of his time out of London, either at Oxford or in the West of England; and Lord King has given three passages from his Journal, the last dated June 17, which plainly show his sense of the delirium that still prevailed on the subject of the Popish Plot. The trial of the five Jesuits, and Langhorne, the lawyer, were then going on, or in preparation; and Sir George Wakeman, the Queen's physician, was acquitted in the following month, which may be said to have terminated the frenzy, so disgraceful to the nation; for except Stafford's, it was the last of the trials. Shaftesbury was now in avowed opposition to the Court; and for some time his party had every success that could be expected, short of passing the Exclusion bill, in which they were always foiled by the House of Lords. The new parliament had been returned, with a decisive majority in favour of the country party. The King dissolved it; and another was chosen of the very same description,—the last that met in Charles's reign, and known by the name of the Oxford Parliament. He suddenly dissolved it also, in March 1681; and, within a month or two, the most humiliating spectacle was exhibited by the people of England, that the history of popular

---

\* Temple—Memoirs from 1629, to his retirement.

fickleness can produce, in ancient or in modern times. The whole tide of popularity was turned in favour of the Court, and the King, and even the Duke of York. The sanguinary delusions of the plot seem to have stricken the infatuated nation with a kind of self-hatred, to be gratified only by running blind into the opposite extremity.

‘The Grand Juries,’ says Burnet, ‘and the Bench of Justices’ in the counties, the Cities, and Boroughs—the franchises and ‘corporations, many manors, the companies in towns, and at last ‘the very apprentices, sent up addresses.’ The purport of these addresses was to declare a full confidence in the King, readiness to devote lives and fortunes to his service, condemnation of the Bill of Exclusion, and charges against the late parliament as seditious, and even treasonable—for having faithfully represented the sense, or rather the violence, of those very addressers upon the subject of Popery and the Duke. ‘And the clergy,’ says the Bishop from whom we have just been quoting, ‘struck up a ‘higher note, with such zeal for the Duke’s succession, as if ‘a Popish king had been a special blessing from Heaven, to be ‘much longed for by a Protestant church!’—(II. 501.) The Court perceived its advantage, and improved it by turning out of the Commissions of the Peace and the Militia, all who were of doubtful attachment. ‘And such of the clergy,’ says our author, ‘as would not engage in that fury, were cried out upon as ‘betrayers of the church; but,’ he adds, ‘the truth is, their numbers were not great. One observed, that according to the proverb in the Gospel, *where the carcass is, there the eagles will be gathered together*; the scent of preferment will draw aspiring ‘men after it.’ Then began, as Lord King freely expresses it, that campaign of judicial murders, which continued without remorse or pity to the end of the reign; and which, we may add, plainly showed, as, indeed, the whole history of despotism in this island proves, that, with hardly any exception, the Judges of the land have been found the ready instruments of the most cruel and profligate of our Tyrants. It is lamentable to think that almost the only person who escaped their base violence, was the least worthy of those whom the Court had resolved to murder. Shaftesbury being charged with high-treason, the Grand Jury threw out the bill; but it was the last resistance made to the pleasure of the Crown. All the other victims of its malignity were regularly handed over, by ‘the oaths of good and lawful men,’ to the ‘justice administered in mercy’ by the despot’s ermined sycophants, who, we are authorized by legislative authority to say, killed and murdered them in detail. It was manifestly dangerous for Shaftesbury to rely on the frail chance of a second escape; he retired into Holland, where he died soon after; and his

illustrious friend, deeming it unsafe to remain any longer in a country so ruled and so judged, went also, about the end of 1683, into voluntary exile.

That the Mitre was not behind the Ermine, in the foul contamination of those times, we have abundant proof, both from the general conduct of the church as described by Bishop Burnet, and from the strain, composed by the heads of the Hierarchy, to testify the gratitude of the nation for its enslavement. Lord King has given us the form of prayer appointed for the thanksgiving holden upon the 9th of September, 1683, and which he justly observes, 'might have been supposed to proceed rather 'from the Mufti and the Ulema, than from the Bishops and rulers 'of the Christian Church of England.' They exult in the reflection that God 'had given their gracious King Charles the 'necks of his enemies;'—that is of the virtuous Russell, who had suffered, and of Sidney, who was yet to be delivered over to the inhuman Jeffries. They acknowledge, that in all ages the Almighty has 'shed forth his power in the miraculous protection of 'righteous and religious Kings,' and 'yield, from the very bottom 'of their hearts, *unfeigned* thanks' for the delivery of those two righteous and religious princes, Charles and James, from the 'unnatural and hellish conspiracy of wicked and ungodly men.' Upon these Princes and their posterity they pray that the crown may for ever flourish; and, under the form of a prayer for enemies, they pour out all imaginable abuse upon their political antagonists; thus—'Bow down the stiff neck and the iron sinew —take away the brass from the whore's forehead, and make 'their faces ashamed.' 'Take from them their confident mistakes, their carnal ends, and their secular interests,' &c. &c.

It was at this period that Locke's removal from his Studentship at Christ Church took place, by virtue of an illegal order of the King; cheerfully, almost thankfully, submitted to by the base priest who then filled the see of Oxford and deanery of Christ Church. Lord Grenville has lately proved, satisfactorily, that the common version of this memorable passage, which treats it as an expulsion, and as the act of the University, is incorrect: it was a deprivation of his collegiate situation by the Dean and Chapter of the lesser body. Lord King has given us the correspondence between the court of St James's and their wretched slaves of the University. Sunderland writes to the Bishop in November 1684, that the King understands that 'one Mr Locke, 'who belonged to the late Lord Shaftesbury, and has on several 'occasions behaved himself very factiously and undutifully to the 'government, is a student of Christ Church;' and adds, 'that his 'Majesty would have him removed from being a student, and that

Originals deposited in the Public Library

Class No. 7770

Date 30.7.75



‘in order thereto, the Bishop would let them know the method of doing it.’ The answer of the Right Reverend Father is truly worthy of being preserved, as a sample of surpassing meanness and treachery. We shall insert it, and afterwards give, in another letter addressed to Locke himself a few years before, the proof that this hateful pander of despotism, this forward tool of persecution, was the friend of the man whom he was so eager to betray.

‘RIGHT HON.

Nov. 8, 1684.

‘I have received the honour of your Lordship’s letter, wherein you are pleased to enquire concerning Mr Locke’s being a student of this house, of which I have this account to render; that he being, as your Lordship is truly informed, a person who was much trusted by the late Earl of Shaftesbury, and who is suspected to be ill-affected to the Government, I have for divers years had an eye upon him; but so close has his guard been on himself, that after several strict enquiries, I may confidently affirm there is not any one in the College, however familiar with him, who has heard him speak a word either against, or so much as concerning, the government; and although very frequently, both in public and in private, discourses have been purposely introduced, to the disparagement of his master, the Earl of Shaftesbury, his party, and designs, he could never be provoked to take any notice, or discover in word or look the least concern; so that I believe there is not in the world such a master of taciturnity and passion. He has here a physician’s place, which frees him from the exercise of the college, and the obligation which others have to residence in it, and he is now abroad upon want of health; but notwithstanding that, I have summoned him to return home; which is done with this prospect, that if he comes not back, he will be liable to expulsion for contumacy; if he does, he will be answerable to your Lordship for what he shall be found to have done amiss; it being probable, that though he may have been thus cautious here, where he knew himself to be suspected, he has laid himself more open in London, where a general liberty of speaking was used, and where the execrable designs against his Majesty, and his Government, were managed and pursued. If he does not return by the 1st day of January next, which is the time limited to him, I shall be enabled of course to proceed against him to expulsion. But if this method seem not effectual or speedy enough, and his Majesty, our founder and visitor, shall please to command his immediate remove, upon the receipt thereof, directed to the Dean and Chapter, it shall accordingly be executed by,

‘My Lord,

‘Your Lordship’s most humble and obedient servant,

‘J. OXON.’

The immediate answer of Sunderland brings the grossly unlawful order of the crown to deprive; and the Bishop forthwith replies that it has been ‘fully executed.’ This calls forth an *expression of satisfaction*, on the King’s part, ‘with the College’s

Bishop Fell's previous letter to Locke, above alluded to, is as follows :

‘ SIR,

‘ June 1, 1680.

‘ You are not to excuse your address by letter as if it could give a trouble to me ; I assure you I have that respect and friendship for you, that I should have been glad to have heard from you, although you had no other business than to let me know you were in health, especially since you left this place in such a condition as might make your friends apprehensive for you. As to the proposal concerning books, we have two years since quit our hands of our stock to men of trade, so that the interest is now with those we dealt with. I have spoke this morning with one of them, Mr Pitt, who within few days will be in London, and will there attend upon you ; he seems to approve of the terms offered, so that I presume he will close with them. I have no more to add at present, but desire that when you write to Monsieur Justell, you would represent the esteem I have for him. Let me also desire you to be assured that I am your affectionate friend,

‘ JOHN OXON.’

But one sentiment can fill the mind upon this base man's conduct ; yet must we not shut our eyes to the lesson which is afforded by that of the Court. They err grievously who fancy that absolute princes are not to be abhorred so much as mean, though more petty tyrants, because they never come into conflict with individuals. Mr Fox wisely, as well as eloquently, expresses a different opinion, upon a subject which he had long and profoundly considered. ‘ Thus while,’ says he, ‘ without the shadow of a crime, Mr Locke lost a situation attended with some emolument and great convenience, was the University deprived of, or rather thus, from the base principles of servility, did she cast away, the man, the having produced whom is now her chiefest glory ; and thus to those who are not determined to be blind, did the true nature of absolute power discover itself, against which the middling station is not more secure than the most exalted. Tyranny, when glutted with the blood of the great, and the plunder of the rich, will condescend to hunt humbler game ; and make the peaceable and innocent Fellow of a College the object of its persecution. In this instance, one would almost imagine there was some instinctive sagacity in the government of that time, which pointed out to them, even before he had made himself known to the world, the man who was destined to be the most successful adversary of superstition and tyranny.’—(*History*.)

irreligious publications, was in force, as is well known, until 1694, when it was allowed to expire, the House of Commons having refused to renew it. Lord King has given a curious and valuable Piece of Locke's, probably prepared by him upon that occasion. It contains his observations upon the objectionable clauses of the bill; and the reader will not fail to observe, in the passage we shall extract, that one of the substitutes for a licenser, which he points out, is the law passed above a century afterwards; while, at the Revolution, when men's tempers were as much heated, and their party differences ran as high, as they ever did since, our ancestors were content to abolish the Censorship, which had existed above thirty years, and to take no surety against the licentiousness of the press beyond what the common law provided.

"An Act for preventing abuses in Printing seditious, treasonable, and unlicensed Books and Pamphlets, and for regulating Printing and Printing-presses."

"§ 2. Heretical, seditious, schismatical, or offensive books, wherein any thing contrary to Christian faith, or the doctrine or discipline of the Church of England, is asserted; or which may tend to the scandal of religion, or the church, or the government, or governors of the church, state, or of any corporation, or particular person, are prohibited to be printed, imported, published, or sold."

Some of these terms are so general and comprehensive, or at least so submitted to the sense and interpretation of the governors of church and state for the time being, that it is impossible any book should pass but just what suits their humours. And who knows but that the motion of the earth may be found to be heretical, as asserting Antipodes once was?

"I know not why a man should not have liberty to print whatever he would speak; and to be answerable for the one, just as he is for the other, if he transgresses the law in either. But gagging a man, for fear he should talk heresy or sedition, has no other ground than such as will make gyves necessary, for fear a man should use violence if his hands were free; and must at last end in the imprisonment of all whom you will suspect may be guilty of treason or misdemeanour. To prevent men being undiscovered for what they print, you may prohibit any book to be printed, published, or sold, without the printer's or bookseller's name, under great penalties, whatever be in it. And then let the printer or bookseller, whose name is to it, be answerable for whatever is against law in it, as if he were the author, unless he can produce the person he had it from, which is all the restraint that ought to be upon printing."

About the same period began the intimacy between Newton and Locke, which furnishes so interesting a part of their biography. Lord King has conferred a very important favour upon literary history, by inserting in this volume some monuments of that memorable friendship. One of these will more particularly interest the mathematical reader. It is a demonstration of the most important of the propositions in the *Principia*, certainly

the fundamental one, and its principal corollary; and we presume that this must have been drawn out for the purpose of explaining the matter fully to Locke. Lord King says that the paper containing it is indorsed, 'Mr Newton, March 1689,' and was communicated *before* the *Principia* was published; but this, however the indorsement may be accounted for, is a mistake; the *Principia*, as is well known, having been published in 1687. The demonstration begins with three hypotheses, of which two are the first Axioms or Laws of Motion, and the third is the first corollary to the third axiom, in B. i. *Princ. i.* We then have the important proposition of the radius vector, describing equal areas in equal times; the well-known Prop. 1, of the second section, demonstrated nearly in the same manner in which it is there given. Then follows the first proposition of the third section, in substance, but given in the form of a theorem upon the law of attraction in elliptical orbits. The construction and demonstration differ materially from those in the *Principia*, and three lemmas are prefixed; the substance of one of which we recognise in the early part of the demonstration in the *Principia*; and it forms the subject of a note in the Jesuit's Commentary on that proposition. These lemmas are expressed in a more explanatory form than those of the *Principia* usually are; and we may conclude from hence, that Newton's illustrious pupil had required him to state as plainly as possible the grounds of his fundamental doctrine.

But these things, how interesting soever to mathematicians, will not arrest the attention of the general reader so much as the very curious correspondence of Newton, which Lord King has now, for the first time, given to the world in its complete state. Some of the correspondence relates to the letter which Newton had addressed to Locke upon the famous verse in John, (1 John v. 7,) and the controverted passage, 1 Tim. iii. 16. He had been desirous at one time to have his researches upon these texts published; but being anxious to avoid controversy, and aware of the virulence with which he would be attacked by the intolerant monopolists of orthodoxy, as soon as his theory was made known, he begged Locke to have it translated into French, and published on the Continent. Locke therefore sent the manuscript over to his learned correspondent, Le Clerc, in Holland, without disclosing the name of the author. Some time after, however, Newton seems to have been alarmed at the risk of being discovered; for we find the following letter addressed to Locke:

'SIR, Cambridge, Feb. 16th, 1691-2.  
'Your former letters came not to my hand, but this I have. I was of

opinion my papers had lain still, and am sorry to hear there is news about them. Let me entreat you to stop their translation and impression so soon as you can; for I design to suppress them. If your friend hath been at any pains and charge, I will repay it, and gratify him. I am very glad my Lord Monmouth is still my friend, but intend not to give his lordship and you any farther trouble. My inclinations are to sit still. I am to beg his lordship's pardon, for pressing into his company the last time I saw him. I had not done it, but that Mr Pawlin pressed me into the room. Miracles, of good credit, continued in the Church for about two or three hundred years. Gregorius Thaumaturgus had his name from thence, and was one of the latest who was eminent for that gift; but of their number and frequency, I am not able to give you a just account. The history of those ages is very imperfect. Mr Pawlin told me, you had writ for some of Mr Boyle's red earth, and by that I knew you had the receipt.

‘Your most affectionate and humble servant,

‘IS. NEWTON.’

Accordingly, Le Clerc did not proceed with the publication, but kept the papers himself till Locke's death in 1704; and never having been informed to whom they belonged, deposited them in the Library of the Remonstrants, where they were found, and published in 1754.

Other parts of Newton's correspondence relate to his opinions upon passages in the Prophecies, which appear to have engrossed a great share of his attention; especially after he ceased to devote himself to science so unremittingly as he did during his early life.

‘SIR,

‘Cambridge, Feb. 7, 1690-1.

‘I am sorry your journey proved to so little purpose, though it delivered you from the trouble of the company the day after. You have obliged me by mentioning me to my friends at London, and I must thank both you and my Lady Masham for your civilities at Oates, and for not thinking that I made a long stay there. I hope we shall meet again in due time, and then I should be glad to have your judgment upon some of my mystical fancies. The Son of man, Dan. vii. I take to be the same with the Word of God upon the White Horse in Heaven, Apoc. xix. and him to be the same with the Man Child, Apoc. xii. for both are to rule the nations with a rod of iron; but whence are you certain that the Ancient of Days is Christ? Does Christ anywhere sit upon the throne? If Sir Francis Masham be at Oates, present, I pray, my service to him with his lady, Mrs Cudworth, and Mrs Masham. Dr Covel is not in Cambridge. I am, &c.

‘IS. NEWTON.’

But the most singular part of this correspondence relates to that very affecting passage of Newton's life, in which it certainly does appear, that his great mind, whether from some bodily ailment, or some original morbid predisposition, or from too vast a burden being imposed upon it, had, for a season, been liable to aberrations. As the dates are here material, we

shall, first of all, refer to the authority upon which this passage in the history of Newton rests; and of which so melancholy a confirmation is afforded in the volume before us. In a manuscript Diary of the famous Huygens, preserved in the Library of Leyden, there is a note stating, that, on the 29th May, 1694, a Scotchman, of the name of Colin, informed him, that eighteen months before, Newton had become deranged, in consequence either of too severe application, or of distress at the loss of his papers, which were accidentally burnt; that his alienation had appeared in a conference with the Archbishop; and that, having been confined by his friends, he gradually recovered, so as of late to have been capable of resuming his pursuits. This would bring the period of his being taken ill to December 1692; and there is a manuscript letter of Mr de la Pryne, at Cambridge, dated the February following, in which the well-known circumstance of the burning of the papers of the calculations, by his lap-dog, is mentioned; and a statement added, that Newton 'was so troubled thereat, that every one thought he would have run mad, and he was not himself for a month after.' We may here observe, in passing, how wide of the truth the common version of the anecdote seems to be, which gives it as a striking instance of Newton's extreme composure and patience, that he contented himself with exclaiming, to the cause of his loss, 'Diamond! thou little knowest what mischief thou hast done!'

These facts would fix the winter of 1692-3 as the period when this malady commenced. Perhaps we may discern a degree of irritability and suspicion in the earlier part of the same year. The letter already quoted has something of it; and one respecting Mr Montague, afterwards Lord Halifax, seems to be tinged with very unmerited suspicions of that person, who had been his colleague in the representation of Cambridge, and having always the highest esteem for him, obtained for him, a few years after, the office of Master of the Mint.

'SIR,

'Cambridge, Jan. 26th, 1691-2.

'Being fully convinced that Mr Montague, upon an old grudge which I thought had been worn out, is false to me, I have done with him, and intend to sit still, unless my Lord Monmouth be still my friend. I have now no prospect of seeing you any more, unless you will be so kind as to repay that visit I made you the last year. If I may hope for this favour, I pray bring my papers with you. Otherwise I desire you would send them by some convenient messenger when opportunity shall serve. My humble service to my Lady Masham, and to Sir Francis if at Oates.

'I am your most humble servant,

'IS. NEWTON.'

There is likewise another letter, in August of the same year, containing a good deal of suspicion insinuated against Mr Boyle. But these things would have excited no rash observation had

they not been followed by the letters of the next year. In September 1693 he thus writes to Locke :

‘ SIR,

‘ Being of opinion that you endeavoured to embroil me with women and by other means, I was so much affected with it, as that when one told me you were sickly and would not live, I answered, ’twere better if you were dead. I desire you to forgive me this uncharitableness. For I am now satisfied that what you have done is just, and I beg your pardon for my having hard thoughts of you for it, and for representing that you struck at the root of morality, in a principle you laid in your book of ideas, and designed to pursue in another book, and that I took you for a Hobbist. I beg your pardon also for saying or thinking that there was a design to sell me an office, or to embroil me.

‘ I am your most humble and unfortunate servant,

‘ IS. NEWTON.’

Locke’s answer is admirable—full of right and amiable feeling towards his illustrious friend, and breathing the dignity, at the same time, of a person wholly unconscious of any offence.

‘ SIR,

‘ Oates, Oct. 5th, 93.

‘ I have been, ever since I first knew you, so entirely and sincerely your friend, and thought you so much mine, that I could not have believed what you tell me of yourself, had I had it from any body else. And though I cannot but be mightily troubled that you should have had so many wrong and unjust thoughts of me, yet next to the return of good offices, such as from a sincere good will I have ever done you, I receive your acknowledgment of the contrary as the kindest thing you could have done me, since it gives me hopes that I have not lost a friend I so much valued. After what your letter expresses, I shall not need to say any thing to justify myself to you. I shall always think your own reflection on my carriage both to you and all mankind, will sufficiently do that. Instead of that, give me leave to assure you, that I am more ready to forgive you than you can be to desire it; and I do it so freely and fully, that I wish for nothing more than the opportunity to convince you that I truly love and esteem you; and that I have still the same good will for you as if nothing of this had happened. To confirm this to you more fully, I should be glad to meet you any where, and the rather, because the conclusion of your letter makes me apprehend it would not be wholly useless to you. But whether you think it fit or not, I leave wholly to you. I shall always be ready to serve you to my utmost, in any way you shall like, and shall only need your commands or permission to do it.

‘ My book is going to press for a second edition; and though I can answer for the design with which I writ it, yet since you have so opportunely given me notice of what you have said of it, I should take it as a favour, if you would point out to me the places that gave occasion to that censure, that by explaining myself better, I may avoid being mistaken by others, or unawares doing the least prejudice to truth or virtue. I am sure you are so much a friend to them both, that were you none to me, I could expect this from you. But I cannot doubt but you would do a

great deal more than this for my sake, who after all have all the concern of a friend for you, wish you extremely well, and am without compliment,' &c.—

The letter which this called forth from Newton, shows plainly the unhappy state in which he must then have been.

'The last winter, by sleeping too often by my fire, I got an ill habit of sleeping; and a distemper, which this summer has been epidemical, put me farther out of order, so that when I wrote to you, I had not slept an hour a night for a fortnight together, and for five nights together not a wink. I remember I wrote to you, but what I said of your book I remember not. If you please to send me a transcript of that passage, I will give you an account of it, if I can.'

These disclosures may, perhaps, serve to explain the otherwise remarkable fact of this illustrious person having completed all his discoveries before he attained the age of forty-five, and done nothing after that, although he lived in perfect enjoyment of health forty years longer.

Several letters of Lord Somers are given in this volume. The following was written during the election, apparently, of King William's first Parliament. It indicates the great confidence which that wise and virtuous man reposed in Locke, and the deference which he paid to his judgment upon the practical details of politics. Nor was this confined to expressions; he not only consulted him upon many occasions, as appears by the other letters, but he caused him to be appointed to a seat at the Council of Trade.

'DEAR SIR,

'Oxon, Wednesday, 5th March, 1689.

'Since you have wished so kindly to my election, I cannot but think it my duty to give you an account that yesterday morning my old partner, Mr Bromley, and myself, were chosen at Worcester without any opposition. I know you will be pleased to hear that my Lord Bellamont has all the reason in the world to be assured of being elected at Droitwich, and I hope the next post will bring you a certain account that it is so, tomorrow being his day. This day was the election for the county of Worcester, and I doubt not but Mr Foley and Sir Fr. Winnington were chosen; which may be looked upon as good fortune, for there would have been danger from any pretenders, as far as I can find, by the sense of the county. I was very willing to get out of the town as soon as my election was over, and so got into the circuit at this place, from whence I shall go back to Worcester, where I hope you will make me so happy as to let me receive another letter from you, in which I will beg your advice, (for by this time you have an account of the bulk of the elections,) whether you think I may go on in the circuit or not: what you write shall be my rule in this point. If I could hope to be useful, I would not fail to be at the opening of the session; but if there be no hopes of it, (and that the Gazette inclines me to believe,) I would take the advantage of the whole circuit, since I am now engaged in it. This letter I beg from you by Saturday's post; and when I have the satisfaction of seeing you, I will beg your par-



don for this freedom, which nothing but your kindness to me upon all occasions, as well as my dependence upon your judgment, could have drawn me to. I am earnest in expectation of your thoughts in this and greater matters, and shall be often wishing for the coming of the post to Worcester on Monday next. I am, Sir, your most faithful, humble servant,

‘J. SOMERS.’

The bad state of the coin about the year 1695, was such as to call for the attention of the Government. The *practical men*, as they are wont to call themselves, and who often are the most fanciful of speculators, only that their theory, being founded on a partial view of a few facts, (and, therefore, necessarily false,) assumes the shape of detail, recommended as the obvious remedy an alteration of the standard; but, happily for the credit and the interest of the country, it had at that time ministers both honest and sagacious enough to pursue a different course. Lord Somers and Sir William Turnbull preferred the councils of Mr Locke to those of Mr Lowndes and his *practical* friends; and the great measure of the recoinage was carried through. The following letter of the Lord Keeper was written to Locke during the heat of this controversy; and we subjoin Lord King's remarks upon the comparison between the period when his illustrious kinsman bore so conspicuous a share in the councils of the state, and that in which he himself took a part, distinguished alike for integrity and talents.

‘SIR,

‘November, 95.

‘You will easily see by the book which was put in my hand last night, and by the title of a Report which it bears, as well as by the advertisement at the end of it, that you were in the right when you said that the alteration of the standard was the thing aimed at. The challenge at the end, if you will allow me to say so, is in some sort directed to you. The proposition which you and I discoursed upon yesterday is endeavoured to be represented impracticable. The passing of money by weight is said to be ridiculous, at least in little payments; the sudden fall of guineas will be an utter ruin to very great numbers; there is no encouragement proposed to invite people to bring the clipped money into the Mint, so that will be melted down to be transported, which will be a certain profit at least, till by a law money can be exported. And whilst this is doing nothing will be left to carry on commerce, for no one will bring out his guineas to part with them for twenty shillings when he paid thirty shillings for them so lately. These, as I remember, were the objections made use of; and I doubt not but you will, without great difficulty, help us with some expedients for them. I believe it an easier task than to remove what I see is so fixed, the project of alteration of the standard.’

Lord King's observations are as follows :

‘The difference between the embarrassments which affected the currency in the reign of King William, and those which have occurred in our own time, may be thus stated :—The coin, at the period first mentioned,

had been deteriorated by the frauds of individuals and the neglect of the public, but when the evil was felt, and the remedy pointed out, the Parliament, notwithstanding the pressure of the war, and the false theories of the practical men of those days, applied the proper remedy at the proper time before any great permanent debt had been incurred. In our own time the depreciation of the currency was entirely to be attributed to the Bank and the Government. The paper-money of a banking company, without the one indispensable condition of security against excesses, *payment in specie on demand*, was in an evil hour substituted in place of the King's lawful coin; and in order that the Minister might avoid the imputation of being an unskilful financier, who borrowed money on unfavourable terms, a debt of unexampled magnitude was accumulated in a debased currency, to be ultimately discharged by payment in specie at the full and lawful standard. It must be confessed, that by the tardy act of retributive justice, which was passed in 1819, the punishment inflicted upon the nation was in the exact proportion to the former deviations from good faith and sound principle, and we may at least hope that the severity of the penalty will prevent, for the future, a repetition of the same folly.

The increase of Locke's infirmities, from his asthmatic complaint, had made him resign his seat at the Board of Trade, notwithstanding the pressing instances of the Chancellor; for he felt an invincible repugnance to retaining the office when he must leave a part of its duties undone. For the same reason he declined a proposal of another, and apparently a higher situation, made to him by the King himself, who sent for him to Kensington that he might persuade him to accept it. The air of London appears to have been unfriendly to his ailment; and he spent the last four years of his life at the seat of Sir Francis and Lady Masham, at Oates in Essex, where he had occasionally resided during many preceding years. The correspondence with his cousin, afterwards Lord Chancellor King, at this period of his life, is full of the gentlest affection, mixed with his wonted sagacity, and with the warmest attachment to the liberties of his country. We can only give one of the letters; apparently among the last which his kinsman received from him.

‘ Oates, June 1, 1704.

‘ I have received no letters from you since the 20th. I remember it is the end of a Term, a busy time with you, and you intend to be here speedily, which is better than writing at a distance. Pray be sure to order your matters so as to spend all the next week with me: as far as I can impartially guess, it will be the last week I am ever like to have with you; for if I mistake not very much, I have very little time left in the world. This comfortable, and to me usually restorative season of the year, has no effect upon me for the better: on the contrary, my shortness of breath, and uneasiness, every day increases; my stomach, without any visible cause, sensibly decays, so that all appearances concur to warn me, that the dissolu-

tion of this cottage is not far off. Refuse not, therefore, to help me to pass some of the last hours of my life as easily as may be in the conversation of one who is not only the nearest, but the dearest to me, of any man in the world. I have a great many things to talk to you, which I can talk to nobody else about. I therefore desire you again, deny not this to my affection. I know nothing at such a time so desirable, and so useful, as the conversation of a friend one loves and relies on. It is a week free from business, or, if it were not, perhaps you would have no reason to repent the bestowing a day or two upon me. Make haste, therefore, on Saturday, and be here early: I long till I see you. I writ to you in my last, to bring some cherries with you, but fear they will be troublesome to you; and these things that entertain the senses, have lost with me a great part of their relish; therefore, give not yourself any trouble about them; such desires are usually but the fancy seeking pleasure in one thing, when it has missed it in another, and seeks in vain for the delight which the indisposition of the body has put an end to. When I have your company, I shall forget these kind of things. I am, dear cousin, your most affectionate,

‘J. LOCKE.’

The close of his life is thus simply, but strikingly, described by Lord King:

‘In October, 1704, his disorder greatly increased: on the 27th of that month Lady Masham, not finding him in his study as usual, went to his bedside, when he told her that the fatigue of getting up the day before had been too much for his strength, and that he never expected to rise again from his bed. He said that he had now finished his career in this world, and that in all probability he should not outlive the night, certainly not to be able to survive beyond the next day or two. After taking some refreshment, he said to those present that he wished them all happiness after he was gone. To Lady Masham, who remained with him, he said that he thanked God he had passed a happy life, but that now he found that all was vanity, and exhorted her to consider this world only as a preparation for a better state hereafter. He would not suffer her to sit up with him, saying, that perhaps he might be able to sleep, but if any change should happen, he would send for her. Having no sleep in the night, he was taken out of bed and carried into his study, where he slept for some time in his chair: after waking, he desired to be dressed, and then heard Lady Masham read the Psalms, apparently with great attention, until perceiving his end to draw near, he stopped her, and expired a very few minutes afterwards, about three o'clock in the evening of the 28th October, in his 73d year.’—P. 263.

It is hard to say, whether mankind are more indebted to this illustrious person as a philosopher, or as a politician. The publication of his great work undoubtedly fixed an era in the history of science: But his writings, and his personal exertions in favour of liberty, and more especially of religious Toleration, may be truly said to have had a greater effect than can be ascribed to the efforts of any other individual who bore a part in the transactions of that important period. The true doctrines of

Toleration were first promulgated by him, and in their fullest extent; for he maintained the whole stretch of the principle, that opinion is not a matter cognizable by the civil magistrate, and that belief, being the result of reason, is wholly independent of the will, and neither the subject of praise nor of blame, far less the object of punishment or of reward. That intolerance had ceased at the Reformation—that the Protestant Church had put an end to persecution—is an error only of the most ignorant and superficial. The influence of the Reformation had, no doubt, been salutary in this as in other respects; but persecution had been mitigated by very slow degrees; and in its early stages, the reformed church was to the full as intolerant, and nearly as persecuting, as the hierarchy which it had supplanted. Witness the numerous executions of Catholics, and even of Protestant Dissenters, in the reign of Elizabeth, accompanied not unfrequently by the most cruel tortures.\* At a late period, the Episcopalian church in Scotland even surpassed the cruelties of the older times; and the intolerance of the Presbyterians during the whole of the seventeenth century, is too well known to require any particular reference. It is from the era of the Revolution that we must date the establishment of that Toleration which the Reformation had in no respect secured; and of which the Independents themselves had only made a beginning, great as were their services to the cause of liberty. It has been reserved for our own times to carry the principles of Locke to their full extent, and to supply those deficiencies in the plan of religious freedom which he and his worthy coadjutors were unfortunately obliged to leave in their grand work.

This volume contains a number of interesting pieces not hitherto published, in which Locke's sentiments on Ecclesiastical matters are clearly and forcibly expounded. The great confidence which was reposed in his judgment by the leaders at the Revolution, and by none more than King William, is well known. We recommend, then, the following passages, taken with little or no selection from these valuable fragments, to the

---

\* It conveys a striking idea of the persecuting spirit of that age, to find Fox (the Martyrologist) addressing to Elizabeth an earnest entreaty, that she would be pleased only to put a stop to the *burning* of the Anabaptists in Smithfield; he seems to think it a great deal too much to seek that no punishments, even no capital punishments, should be inflicted for the heresy of dissent; he only begs that such '*horrors*' as burning should be disallowed. 'There are chains,' he says, 'there is exile, there are branding and stripes, and even the gibbet; this alone (burning) I earnestly deprecate.'

attention of those who are in the habit of dwelling upon the glories and the memory of '*our Deliverer.*'

— 'The particular churches in different cities, directed by the prudence, and enlarged by the preaching, of these presbyters, under whose care they were left, spread themselves so, that, in succession of time, in some places, they made great numbers of converts in the neighbourhood and villages round about, all which so converted made an accession to, and became members of, the church of the neighbouring city, which became an episcopacy, and the *παρεκκlesia*, from which our own name parish comes the diocese, which was the name that remained in use for a bishop's diocese a good while in the Church; how far the *παρεκκlesia*, in the first times of Christianity, reached, the signification of the word itself, which denotes neighbourhood, will easily tell us, and could certainly extend no farther than might permit the Christians that lived in it to frequent the Christian assemblies in the city, and enjoy the advantage of Church communion. Though the number of believers were, in some of these cities, more than could meet in one assembly for the hearing of the word, and performing public acts of worship, and so, consequently, had divers basilicas, or churches, as well as several presbyters to officiate in them, yet they continued one church and one congregation, because they continued under the government of the same presbyters, and the presbyters officiated promiscuously in all their meeting-places, and performed all the offices of pastors and teachers indifferently to all the members, as they, on their side, had the liberty to go to which assembly they pleased; a plain instance whereof we have in several Protestant Churches beyond sea, at Nisnes, at St Gall.

'This, probably, seems to be the constitution and bounds of particular churches in the most primitive times of Christianity, different from our present parochial congregations and episcopal dioceses; from the first, because they were independent Churches, each of them governed within themselves by their own presbytery; from the latter they differ in this, that every great town, wherein there were Christians, was a distinct church, which took no great extent round about for its parochia, that what would allow the converts round about to have the convenience of communion and church fellowship, in common with the assemblies of Christians in that town; but afterwards, when these Churches were formed into episcopacies, under the government of single men, and so became subjects of power and matter of ambition, these parochias were extended beyond the convenience of church communion; and human frailty, when it is got into power, naturally endeavouring to extend the bounds of its jurisdiction, episcopal parochias were enlarged, and that name being too narrow, was laid by, and the name of diocese, which signifies large tracts of ground, was taken to signify a bishoprick: which way of uniting several remote assemblies of Christians and Churches under one governor, upon pretence of preventing schism and heresy, and preserving the peace and unity of the Church, gave rise to metropolitans and archbishops, and never stopped (nor, indeed, upon that foundation well could) till it at last ended in supremacy.'—Pp. 353, 354.

—‘ But the clergy (as they call themselves, of the Christian religion, in imitation of the Jewish priesthood) having, almost ever since the first ages of the Church, laid claim to this power, separate from civil government, as received from God himself, have, wherever the civil magistrate hath been Christian, and of their opinion, and superior in power to the clergy, and they not able to cope with him, pretended this power only to be spiritual, and to extend no farther ; but yet still pressed, as a duty on the magistrate, to punish and persecute those whom they disliked and declared against. And so, when they excommunicated, their under officer, the magistrate, was to execute ; and to reward princes for their doing their drudgery, they have (whenever princes have been serviceable to their ends) been careful to preach up monarchy *jure divino* ; for commonwealths have hitherto been less favourable to their power. But notwithstanding the *jus divinum* of monarchy, when any prince had dared to dissent from their doctrines or forms, or been less apt to execute the decrees of the hierarchy, they have been the first and forwardest in giving check to his authority, and disturbance to his government. And princes, on the other side, being apt to hearken to such as seem to advance their authority, and bring in religion to the assistance of their absolute power, have been generally very ready to worry those sheep who have ever so little straggled out of those shepherds’ folds, where they were kept in order to be shorn by them both. Whilst the magistrate, being persuaded it is his duty to punish those the clergy please to call heretics, schismatics, or fanatics, or else taught to apprehend danger from dissension in religion, thinks it his interest to suppress them—persecutes all who observe not the same forms in the religious worship which is set up in his country. The people, on the other side, finding the mischiefs that fall on them for worshipping God according to their own persuasions, enter into confederacies and combinations to secure themselves as well as they can ; so that oppression and vexation on one side, self-defence and desire of religious liberty on the other, create dislikes, jealousies, apprehensions, and factions, which seldom fail to break out into downright persecution, or open war.

‘ But notwithstanding the liberality of the clergy to princes, when they have not strength enough to deal with them, be very large, yet when they are once in a condition to strive with them for the mastery, then is it seen how far their spiritual power extends, and how, *in ordine ad spiritualia*, absolute temporal power comes in. So that ordination, that begins in priesthood, if it be let alone, will certainly grow up to absolute empire ; and though Christ declares himself to have no kingdom of this world, his successors have (whenever they can but grasp the power) a large commission to execute ; and that a rigorously civil dominion. The Popedom hath been a large and lasting instance of this. And what Presbytery could do, even in its infancy, when it had a little humbled the magistrates, let Scotland show.’—Pp. 289—291.

- ART. II.—1. *Records of Woman : with other Poems.* By FELICIA HEMANS. 2d Edition. 12mo. Pp. 323. Edinburgh, 1828.
2. *The Forest Sanctuary : with other Poems.* By FELICIA HEMANS. 2d Edition, with Additions. 12mo. Pp. 325. Edinburgh, 1829.

WOMEN, we fear, cannot do every thing; nor even every thing they attempt. But what they can do, they do, for the most part, excellently—and much more frequently with an absolute and perfect success, than the aspirants of our rougher and more ambitious sex. They cannot, we think, represent naturally the fierce and sullen passions of men—nor their coarser vices—nor even scenes of actual business or contention—and the mixed motives, and strong and faulty characters, by which affairs of moment are usually conducted on the great theatre of the world. For much of this they are disqualified by the delicacy of their training and habits, and the still more disabling delicacy which pervades their conceptions and feelings; and from much they are excluded by their actual inexperience of the realities they might wish to describe—by their substantial and incurable ignorance of business—of the way in which serious affairs are actually managed—and the true nature of the agents and impulses that give movement and direction to the stronger currents of ordinary life. Perhaps they are also incapable of long moral or political investigations, where many complex and indeterminate elements are to be taken into account, and a variety of opposite probabilities to be weighed before coming to a conclusion. They are generally too impatient to get at the ultimate results, to go well through with such discussions; and either stop short at some imperfect view of the truth, or turn aside to repose in the shadow of some plausible error. This, however, we are persuaded, arises entirely from their being seldom set on such tedious tasks. Their proper and natural business is the practical regulation of private life, in all its bearings, affections, and concerns; and the questions with which they have to deal in that most important department, though often of the utmost difficulty and nicety, involve, for the most part, but few elements; and may generally be better described as delicate than intricate;—requiring for their solution rather a quick tact and fine perception than a patient or laborious examination. For the same reason, they rarely succeed in long works, even on subjects the best suited to their genius; their natural training rendering them equally averse to long doubt and long labour.

For all other intellectual efforts, however, either of the un-

derstanding or the fancy, and requiring a thorough knowledge either of man's strength or his weakness, we apprehend them to be, in all respects, as well qualified as their brethren of the stronger sex; while, in their perceptions of grace, propriety, ridicule—their power of detecting artifice, hypocrisy, and affectation—the force and promptitude of their sympathy, and their capacity of noble and devoted attachment, and of the efforts and sacrifices it may require, they are, beyond all doubt, our superiors.


Their business being, as we have said, with actual or social life, and the colours it receives from the conduct and dispositions of individuals, they unconsciously acquire, at a very early age, the finest perception of character and manners, and are almost as soon instinctively schooled in the deep and dangerous learning of feeling and emotion; while the very minuteness with which they make and meditate on these interesting observations, and the finer shades and variations of sentiment which are thus treasured and recorded, trains their whole faculties to a nicety and precision of operation, which often discloses itself to advantage in their application to studies of a very different character. When women, accordingly, have turned their minds—as they have done but too seldom—to the exposition or arrangement of any branch of knowledge, they have commonly exhibited, we think, a more beautiful accuracy, and a more uniform and complete justness of thinking, than their less discriminating brethren. There is a finish and completeness about every thing they put out of their hands, which indicates not only an inherent taste for elegance and neatness, but a habit of nice observation, and singular exactness of judgment.

It has been so little the fashion, at any time, to encourage women to write for publication, that it is more difficult than it should be, to prove these truths by examples. Yet there are enough, within the reach of a very careless and superficial glance over the open field of literature, to enable us to explain, at least, and illustrate, if not entirely to verify, our assertions. No *man*, we will venture to say, could have written the Letters of Madame de Sevigné, or the Novels of Miss Austin, or the Hymns and Early Lessons of Mrs Barbauld, or the Conversations of Mrs Marcet. These performances, too, are not only essentially and intensely feminine, but they are, in our judgment, decidedly more perfect than any masculine productions with which they can be brought into comparison. They accomplish more completely all the ends at which they aim, and are worked out with a gracefulness and felicity of execution which excludes all idea of failure, and entirely satisfies the expectations they may have



raised. We might easily have added to these instances. There are many parts of Miss Edgeworth's earlier stories, and of Miss Mitford's sketches and descriptions, and not a little of Mrs Opie's, that exhibit the same fine and penetrating spirit of observation, the same softness and delicacy of hand, and unerring truth of delineation, to which we have alluded as characterising the purer specimens of female art. The same distinguishing traits of a woman's spirit are visible through the grief and the piety of Lady Russel, and the gaiety, the spite, and the venturesomeness of Lady Mary Wortley. We have not as yet much female poetry; but there is a truly feminine tenderness, purity, and elegance, in the *Psyche* of Mrs Tighe, and in some of the smaller pieces of Lady Craven. On some of the works of Madame de Staël—her *Corinne* especially—there is a still deeper stamp of the genius of her sex. Her pictures of its boundless devotedness—its depth and capacity of suffering—its high aspirations—its painful irritability, and inextinguishable thirst for emotion, are powerful specimens of that morbid anatomy of the heart, which no hand but that of a woman's was fine enough to have laid open, or skilful enough to have recommended to our sympathy and love. There is the same exquisite and inimitable delicacy, if not the same power, in many of the happier passages of Madame de Souza and Madame Cottin—to say nothing of the more lively and yet melancholy records of Madame de Staël, during her long penance in the court of the Duchesse de Maine.

But we are precluding too largely; and must come at once to the point, to which the very heading of this article has already admonished the most careless of our readers that we are tending. We think the poetry of Mrs Hemans a fine exemplification of Female Poetry—and we think it has much of the perfection which we have ventured to ascribe to the happier productions of female genius.

It may not be the best imaginable poetry, and may not indicate the very highest or most commanding genius; but it embraces a great deal of that which gives the very best poetry its chief power of pleasing; and would strike us, perhaps, as more impassioned and exalted, if it were not regulated and harmonized by the most beautiful taste. It is infinitely sweet, elegant, and tender—touching, perhaps, and contemplative, rather than vehement and overpowering; and not only finished throughout with an exquisite delicacy, and even serenity of execution, but informed with a purity and loftiness of feeling, and a certain sober and humble tone of indulgence and piety, which must satisfy all judgments, and allay the apprehensions of those who are most afraid of  passionate exaggerations of poetry. The diction

is always beautiful, harmonious, and free—and the themes, though of infinite variety, uniformly treated with a grace, originality and judgment, which mark the same master hand. These themes she has borrowed, with the peculiar interest and imagery that belong to them, from the legends of different nations, and the most opposite states of society; and has contrived to retain much of what is interesting and peculiar in each of them, without adopting, along with it, any of the revolting or extravagant excesses which may characterise the taste or manners of the people or the age from which it has been derived. She has thus transfused into her German or Scandinavian legends the imaginative and daring tone of the originals, without the mystical exaggerations of the one, or the painful fierceness and coarseness of the other—she has preserved the clearness and elegance of the French, without their coldness or affectation—and the tenderness and simplicity of the early Italians, without their diffuseness or languor. Though occasionally expatiating, somewhat fondly and at large, amongst the sweets of her own planting, there is, on the whole, a great condensation and brevity in most of her pieces, and, almost without exception, a most judicious and vigorous conclusion. The great merit, however, of her poetry, is undoubtedly in its tenderness and its beautiful imagery. The first requires no explanation; but we must be allowed to add a word as to the peculiar charm and character of the latter.

It has always been our opinion, that the very essence of poetry, apart from the pathos, the wit, or the brilliant description which may be embodied in it, but may exist equally in prose, consists in the fine perception and vivid expression of that subtle and mysterious analogy which exists between the physical and the moral world—which makes outward things and qualities the natural types and emblems of inward gifts and emotions, and leads us to ascribe life and sentiment to every thing that interests us in the aspects of external nature. The feeling of this analogy, obscure and inexplicable as the theory of it may be, is so deep and universal in our nature, that it has stamped itself on the ordinary language of men of every kindred and speech: and that to such an extent, that one half of the epithets by which we familiarly designate moral and physical qualities, are in reality so many metaphors, borrowed reciprocally, upon this analogy, from those opposite forms of existence. The very familiarity, however, of the expression, in these instances, takes away its poetical effect—and indeed, in substance, its metaphorical character. The original sense of the word is entirely forgotten in the derivative one to which it has succeeded; and it requires some etymo-

logical recollection to convince us that it was originally nothing else than a typical or analogical illustration. Thus we talk of a penetrating understanding, and a furious blast—a weighty argument, and a gentle stream—without being at all aware that we are speaking in the language of poetry, and transferring qualities from one extremity of the sphere of being to another. In these cases, accordingly, the metaphor, by ceasing to be felt, in reality ceases to exist, and the analogy being no longer intimated, of course can produce no effect. But whenever it is intimated, it does produce an effect; and that effect we think is poetry.

It has substantially two functions, and operates in two directions. In the *first* place, it strikes vividly out, and flashes at once on our minds, the conception of an inward feeling or emotion, which it might otherwise have been difficult to convey, by the presentment of some bodily form or quality, which is instantly felt to be its true representative, and enables us to fix and comprehend it with a force and clearness not otherwise attainable; and, in the *second* place, it vivifies dead and inanimate matter with the attributes of living and sentient mind, and fills the whole visible universe around us with objects of interest and sympathy, by tinging them with the hues of life, and associating them with our own passions and affections. This magical operation the poet too performs, for the most part, in one of two ways—either by the direct agency of similes and metaphors, more or less condensed or developed, or by the mere graceful presentment of such visible objects on the scene of his passionate dialogues or adventures, as partake of the character of the emotion he wishes to excite, and thus form an appropriate accompaniment or preparation for its direct indulgence or display. The former of those methods has perhaps been most frequently employed, and certainly has most attracted attention. But the latter, though less obtrusive, and perhaps less frequently resorted to of set purpose, is, we are inclined to think, the most natural and efficacious of the two; and is often adopted, we believe, unconsciously by poets of the highest order;—the predominant emotion of their minds overflowing spontaneously on all the objects which present themselves to their fancy, and calling out from them, and colouring with its own hues, those that are naturally emblematic of its character, and in accordance with its general expression. It would be easy to show how habitually this is done by Shakspeare, and Milton especially, and how much many of their finest passages are indebted both for force and richness of effect to this general and diffusive harmony of the external cha-

racter of their scenes with the passions of their living agents—this harmonizing and appropriate glow with which they kindle the whole surrounding atmosphere, and bring all that strikes the sense into unison with all that touches the heart.

But it is more to our present purpose to say, that we think the fair writer before us is eminently a mistress of this poetical secret; and, in truth, it was solely for the purpose of illustrating this great charm and excellence in her imagery, that we have ventured upon this little dissertation. Almost all her poems are rich with fine descriptions, and studded over with images of visible beauty. But these are never idle ornaments: All her pomps have a meaning; and her flowers and her gems are arranged, as they are said to be among Eastern lovers, so as to speak the language of truth and of passion. This is peculiarly remarkable in some little pieces, which seem at first sight to be purely descriptive—but are soon found to tell upon the heart, with a deep moral and pathetic impression. But it is a truth nearly as conspicuous in the greater part of her productions; where we scarcely meet with any striking sentiment that is not ushered in by some such symphony of external nature—and scarcely a lovely picture that does not serve as a foreground to some deep or lofty emotion. We may illustrate this proposition, we think, by opening either of these little volumes at random, and taking what they first present to us.—The following exquisite lines, for example, on a Palm-tree in an English garden :

‘ It waved not thro’ an Eastern sky,  
Beside a fount of Araby ;  
It was not faun’d by southern breeze  
In some green isle of Indian seas,  
Nor did its graceful shadow sleep  
O’er stream of Afric, lone and deep.

‘ But far the exiled Palm-tree grew  
’Midst foliage of no kindred hue ;  
Thro’ the laburnum’s dropping gold  
Rose the light shaft of orient mould,  
And Europe’s violets, faintly sweet,  
Purpled the moss-beds at its feet.

‘ Strange look’d it there !—the willow stream’d  
Where silvery waters near it gleam’d ;  
The lime-bough lured the honey-bee  
To murmur by the Desert’s Tree,  
And showers of snowy roses made  
A lustre in its fan-like shade.

‘ There came an eve of festal hours—  
Rich music fill’d that garden’s bowers :

Lamps, that from flowering branches hung,  
On sparks of dew soft colours flung,  
And bright forms glanced—a fairy show—  
Under the blossoms to and fro.

‘But one, a lone one, ’midst the throng,  
Seem’d reckless all of dance or song :  
He was a youth of dusky mien,  
Whereon the Indian sun had been—  
Of crested brow, and long black hair—  
A stranger, like the Palm-tree, there.

‘And slowly, sadly moved his plumes,  
Glittering athwart the leafy glooms :  
He pass’d the pale green olives by,  
Nor won the chesnut flowers his eye ;  
But when to that sole Palm he came,  
Then shot a rapture through his frame !

‘To him, to him its rustling spoke,  
The silence of his soul it broke !  
It whisper’d of his own bright isle,  
That lit the ocean with a smile ;  
Aye, to his ear that native tone  
Had something of the sea-wave’s moan !

‘His mother’s cabin home, that lay  
Where feathery cocoas fringed the bay ;  
The dashing of his brethren’s oar,  
The conch-note heard along the shore ;—  
All thro’ his wakening bosom swept :  
He clasp’d his country’s Tree—and wept !

‘Oh ! scorn him not !—the strength, whereby  
The patriot girds himself to die,  
Th’ unconquerable power, which fills  
The freeman battling on his hills—  
These have one fountain deep and clear,—  
The same whence gush’d that child-like tear !’

The following, which the author has named, ‘Graves of a Household,’ has rather less of external scenery, but serves, like the others, to show how well the graphic and pathetic may be made to set off each other :

‘They grew in beauty, side by side,  
They fill’d one home with glee ;—  
Their graves are sever’d, far and wide,  
By mount, and stream, and sea.

‘The same fond mother bent at night  
O’er each fair sleeping brow ;  
She had each folded flower in sight,—  
Where are those dreamers now ?

‘ One, midst the forests of the West,  
By a dark stream is laid,—  
The Indian knows his place of rest,  
Far in the cedar shade.

‘ The sea, the blue lone sea, hath one,  
He lies where pearls lie deep :  
*He* was the loved of all, yet none  
O’er his low bed may weep.

‘ One sleeps where southern vines are drest  
Above the noble slain :  
He wrapt his colours round his breast,  
On a blood-red field of Spain.

‘ And one—o’er *her* the myrtle showers  
Its leaves, by soft winds fann’d ;  
She faded ‘midst Italian flowers,—  
The last of that bright band.

‘ And parted thus they rest, who play’d  
Beneath the same green tree ;  
Whose voices mingled as they pray’d  
Around one parent knee !

‘ They that with smiles lit up the hall,  
And cheer’d with song the hearth,—  
Alas ! for love, if *thou* wert all,  
And nought beyond, oh earth !

We have taken these pieces chiefly on account of their shortness : But it would not be fair to Mrs Hemans not to present our readers with one longer specimen—and to give a portion of her graceful narrative along with her pathetic descriptions. This story, of ‘ *The Lady of the Castle,*’ is told, we think, with great force and sweetness :

‘ Thou seest her pictured with her shining hair,  
(Famed were those tresses in Provençal song.)  
Half braided, half o’er cheek and bosom fair  
Let loose, and pouring sunny waves along  
Her gorgeous vest. A child’s right hand is roving  
‘Midst the rich curls, and, oh ! how meekly loving  
Its earnest looks are lifted to the face,  
Which bends to meet its lip in laughing grace !  
Yet that bright lady’s eye methinks hath less  
Of deep, and still, and pensive tenderness,  
Than might bescem a mother’s—on her brow  
Something too much there sits of native scorn,  
And her smile kindles with a conscious glow.  
—These may be dreams—but how shall woman tell  
Of woman’s shame, and not with tears ?—She fell !  
That mother left that child !—went hurrying by  
Its cradle—haply, not without a sigh ;

Haply one moment o'er its rest serene  
 She hung—but no! it could not thus have been,  
 For *she went on!*—forsook her home, her hearth,  
 All pure affection, all sweet household mirth,  
 To live a gaudy and dishonour'd thing,  
 Sharing in guilt the splendours of a king.

‘ Her lord, in very weariness of life,  
 Girt on his sword for scenes of distant strife;  
 He reck'd no more of glory:—grief and shame  
 Crush'd out his fiery nature, and his name  
 Died silently. A shadow o'er his halls  
 Crept year by year; the minstrel pass'd their walls;  
 The warder's horn hung mute:—meantime the child,  
 On whose first flowering thoughts no parent smiled,  
 A gentle girl, and yet deep-hearted, grew  
 Into sad youth; for well, too well, she knew  
 Her mother's tale! Its memory made the sky  
 Seem all too joyous for her shrinking eye;  
 Check'd on her lip the flow of song, which fain  
 Would there have linger'd; flush'd her cheek to pain,  
 If met by sudden glance; and gave a tone  
 Of sorrow, as for something lovely gone,  
 Even to the spring's glad voice. Her own was low  
 And plaintive!—Oh! there lie such depths of woe  
 In a *young* blighted spirit! Manhood rears  
 A haughty brow, and age has done with tears;  
 But youth bows down to misery, in amaze  
 At the dark cloud o'ermantling its fresh days,—  
 And thus it was with her. A mournful sight  
 In one so fair—for she indeed was fair—  
 Not with her mother's dazzling eyes of light.

*Hers* were more shadowy, full of thought and prayer;  
 And with long lashes o'er a white-rose cheek,  
 Drooping in gloom, yet tender still and meek,  
 Still that fond child's—and, oh! the brow above,  
 So pale and pure! so form'd for holy love  
 To gaze upon in silence!—But she felt  
 That love was not for her, though hearts would melt  
 Where'er she moved, and reverence mutely given  
 Went with her; and low prayers, that call'd on Heaven  
 To bless the young Isaure.

‘ One sunny morn,  
 With alms before her castle gate she stood,  
 'Midst peasant-groups; when, breathless and o'erworn,  
 And shrouded in long robes of widowhood,  
 A stranger through them broke:—the orphan maid  
 With her sweet voice, and proffer'd hand of aid,  
 Turn'd to give welcome; but a wild sad look  
 Met hers; a gaze that all her spirit shook;

And that pale woman, suddenly subdued  
 By some strong passion in its gushing mood,  
 Knelt at her feet, and bathed them with such tears  
 As rain the hoarded agonies of years  
 From the heart's urn ; and with her white lips press'd  
 The ground they trode ; then, burying in her vest  
 Her brow's deep flush, sobb'd out—" Oh ! undefiled !  
 I am thy mother—spurn me not, my child !"

' Isaure had pray'd for that lost mother ; wept  
 O'er her stain'd memory, while the happy slept  
 In the hush'd midnight ; stood with mournful gaze  
 Before yon picture's smile of other days,  
 But never breathed in human ear the name  
 Which weigh'd her being to the earth with shame.  
 What marvel if the anguish, the surprise,  
 The dark remembrances, the alter'd guise,  
 Awhile o'erpower'd her?—from the weeper's touch  
 She shrank—'twas but a moment—yet too much  
 For that all-humbled one ; its mortal stroke  
 Came down like lightning, and her full heart broke  
 At once in silence. Heavily and prone  
 She sank, while, o'er her castle's threshold-stone,  
 Those long fair tresses—*they* still brightly wore  
 Their early pride, though bound with pearls no more—  
 Bursting their fillet, in sad beauty roll'd,  
 And swept the dust with coils of wavy gold.

' Her child bent o'er her—call'd her—'twas too late—  
 Dead lay the wanderer at her own proud gate !  
 'The joy of courts, the star of knight and bard,—  
 How didst thou fall, O bright-hair'd Ermengarde !'

The following sketch of 'Joan of Arc in Rheims,' is in a loftier and more ambitious vein ; but sustained with equal grace, and as touching in its solemn tenderness. We can afford to extract but a part of it :

—' Within, the light,  
 Through the rich gloom of pictured windows flowing,  
 Tinged with soft awfulness a stately sight,  
 The chivalry of France, their proud heads bowing  
 In martial vassalage !—while 'midst the ring,  
 And shadow'd by ancestral tombs, a king  
 Received his birthright's crown. For this, the hymn  
 Swell'd out like rushing waters, and the day  
 With the sweet censer's misty breath grew dim,  
 As through long aisles it floated o'er th' array  
 Of arms and sweeping stoles. But who, alone  
 And unapproach'd, beside the altar-stone,  
 With the white banner, forth like sunshine streaming,  
 And the gold helm, through clouds of fragrance gleaming,



Silent and radiant stood?—The helm was raised,  
 And the fair face reveal'd, that upward gazed,  
 Intensely worshipping ;—a still, clear face,  
 Youthful, but brightly solemn !—Woman's cheek  
 And brow were there, in deep devotion meek,  
 Yet glorified with inspiration's trace  
 On its pure paleness ; while, enthroned above,  
 The pictured Virgin, with her smile of love,  
 Seem'd bending o'er her votaress.—That slight form !  
 Was *that* the leader through the battle storm ?  
 Had the soft light in that adorning eye,  
 Guided the warrior where the swords flash'd high ?

..... ' A triumphant strain,  
 A proud rich stream of warlike melodies,  
 Gush'd through the portals of the antique fane,  
 And forth she came.' .....

' The shouts that fill'd  
 The hollow heaven tempestuously, were still'd  
 One moment ; and in that brief pause, the tone,  
 As of a breeze that o'er her home had blown,  
 Sank on the bright maid's heart.—“ Joanne ! ”—Who spoke,

Like those whose childhood with *her* childhood grew  
 Under one roof ?—“ Joanne ! ”—*that* murmur broke

With sounds of weeping forth !—She turn'd—she knew  
 Beside her, mark'd from all the thousands there,  
 In the calm beauty of his silver hair,  
 The stately shepherd ; and the youth, whose joy  
 From his dark eye flash'd proudly ; and the boy,  
 The youngest-born, that ever loved her best :  
 “ Father ! and ye my brothers ! ”—On the breast  
 Of that grey sire she sank—and swiftly back,  
 Even in an instant, to their native track  
 Her free thoughts flow'd.—She saw the pomp no more—  
 The plumes, the banners :—to her cabin door,  
 And to the Fairy's Fountain in the glade,  
 Where her young sisters by her side had play'd,  
 And to her hamlet's chapel, where it rose  
 Hallowing the forest unto deep repose,  
 Her spirit turn'd.—The very wood-note, sung

In early spring-time by the bird, which dwelt  
 Where o'er her father's roof the beech-leaves hung,

Was in her heart ; a music heard and felt,  
 Winning her back to nature.—She unbound  
 The helm of many battles from her head,  
 And, with her bright locks bow'd to sweep the ground,

Lifting her voice up, wept for joy, and said,—  
 “ Bless me, my father, bless me ! and with thee,  
 To the still cabin and the beechen-tree,  
 Let me return ! ”

There are several strains of a more passionate character ;

especially in the two poetical epistles from Lady Arabella Stuart and Properzia Rossi. We shall venture to give a few lines from the former. The Lady Arabella was of royal descent; and having excited the fears of our pusillanimous James by a secret union with the Lord Seymour, was detained in a cruel captivity, by that heartless monarch, till the close of her life—during which she is supposed to have indited this letter to her lover from her prison house.

‘ My friend, my friend ! where art thou ? Day by day,  
Gliding, like some dark mournful stream, away,  
My silent youth flows from me. Spring, the while,

Comes and rains beauty on the kindling boughs  
Round hall and hamlet ; Summer, with her smile,

Fills the green forest ;—young hearts breathe their vows ;  
Brothers, long parted, meet ; fair children rise  
Round the glad bead : Hope laughs from loving eyes :  
—All this is in the world !—These joys lie sown,  
The dew of every path—On *one* alone  
Their freshness may not fall—the stricken deer,  
Dying of thirst with all the waters near.

Ye are from dingle and fresh glade, ye flowers !

By some kind hand to cheer my dungeon sent ;  
O’er you the oak shed down the summer showers,

And the lark’s nest was where your bright cups bent,  
Quivering to breeze and rain-drop, like the sheen  
Of twilight stars. On you Heaven’s eye hath been,  
Through the leaves pouring its dark sultry blue  
Into your glowing hearts ; the bee to you  
Hath murmur’d, and the rill.—My soul grows faint  
With passionate yearning, as its quick dreams paint  
Your haunts by dell and stream,—the green, the free,  
The full of all sweet sound,—the shut from me !

There went a swift bird singing past my cell—

O Love and Freedom ! ye are lovely things !  
With you the peasant on the hills may dwell,

And by the streams ; but I—the blood of kings,  
A proud unmingling river, through my veins  
Flows in lone brightness,—and its gifts are chains !  
—Kings !—I had silent visions of deep bliss,  
Leaving their thrones far distant, and for this  
I am cast under their triumphal car,  
An insect to be crush’d.

‘ Thou hast forsaken me ! I feel, I know,

There would be rescue if this were not so.

Thou’rt at the chase, thou’rt at the festive board,  
Thou’rt where the red wine free and high is pour’d,  
Thou’rt where the dancers meet !—a magic glass  
Is set within my soul, and proud shapes pass,

Flushing it o'er with pomp from bower and hall ;—  
 I see one shadow, stateliest there of all,—  
*Thine !*—What dost *thou* amidst the bright and fair,  
 Whispering light words, and mocking my despair ?  
 It is not well of thee !—my love was more  
 Than fiery song may breathe, deep thought explore ;  
 And there thou smilest while my heart is dying,  
 With all its blighted hopes around it lying ;  
 Ev'n thou, on whom they hung their last green leaf—  
 Yet smile, smile on ! too bright art thou for grief.'

The following, though it has no very distinct object or moral, breathes, we think, the very spirit of poetry, in its bright and vague picturings, and is well entitled to the name it bears—  
 ' An Hour of Romance :'

' There were thick leaves above me and around,  
 And low sweet sighs, like those of childhood's sleep,  
 Amidst their dimness, and a fitful sound  
 As of soft showers on water ;—dark and deep  
 Lay the oak shadows o'er the turf, so still  
 They seem'd but pictured glooms : a hidden rill  
 Made music, such as haunts us in a dream,  
 Under the fern-tufts : and a tender gleam  
 Of soft green light, as by the glow-worm shed,  
 Came pouring thro' the woven beech-boughs down,  
 And steep'd the magic page wherein I read  
 Of royal chivalry and old renown,  
 A tale of Palestine.\*—Meanwhile the bee  
 Swept past me with a tone of summer hours,  
 A drowsy bugle, wafting thoughts of flowers,  
 Blue skies and amber sunshine : brightly free,  
 On filmy wings the purple dragon-fly  
 Shot glancing like a fairy javelin by ;  
 And a sweet voice of sorrow told the dell  
 Where sat the lone wood-pigeon :

But ere long,  
 All sense of these things faded, as the spell  
 Breathing from that high gorgeous tale grew strong  
 On my chain'd soul :—'twas not the leaves I heard—  
 A Syrian wind the Lion-banner stirr'd,  
 Thro' its proud, floating folds :—'twas not the brook,  
 Singing in secret thro' its grassy glen ;—  
 A wild shrill trumpet of the Saracen  
 Peal'd from the desert's lonely heart, and shook  
 The burning air.—Like clouds when winds are high,  
 O'er glittering sands flew steeds of Araby,

---

\* The Talisman—Tales of the Crusaders.

And tents rose up, and sudden lance and spear  
Flash'd where a fountain's diamond wave lay clear,  
Shadow'd by graceful palm-trees. Then the shout  
Of merry England's joy swell'd freely out,  
Sent thro' an Eastern heaven, whose glorious hue  
Made shields dark mirrors to its depths of blue :  
And harps were there ; — I heard their sounding strings,  
As the waste echoed to the mirth of kings.—  
The bright masque faded.—Unto life's worn track,  
What call'd me from its flood of glory, back ?  
A voice of happy childhood !—and they pass'd,  
Banner, and harp, and Paynim trumpet's blast ;  
Yet might I scarce bewail the splendours gone,  
My heart so leap'd to that sweet laughter's tone.'

There is great sweetness in the following portion of a little poem on a ' Girls' School :

' Oh ! joyous creatures ! that will sink to rest,  
Lightly, when those pure orisons are done,  
As birds with slumber's honey-dew opprest,  
'Midst the dim folded leaves, at set of sun—  
Yet in those flute-like voices, mingling low,  
Is Woman's tenderness—how soon her woe !  
' Her look is on you—silent tears to weep,  
And patient smiles to wear through suffering's hour,  
And sunless riches, from affection's deep,  
To pour on broken reeds—a wasted shower !  
And to make idols, and to find them clay,  
And to bewail that worship—therefore pray !  
' Her lot is on you ! to be found untired,  
Watching the stars out by the bed of pain,  
With a pale cheek, and yet a brow inspired,  
And a true heart of hope, though hope be vain ;  
Meekly to bear with wrong, to cheer decay,  
And, oh ! to love through all things—therefore pray !'

There is a fine and stately solemnity in these lines on ' The  
' Lost Pleiad :

' Hath the night lost a gem, the regal night ?  
She wears her crown of old magnificence,  
Though thou art exiled thence—  
No desert seems to part those urns of light,  
'Midst the far depths of purple gloom intense.  
' They rise in joy, the starry myriads burning—  
The shepherd greets them on his mountains free ;  
And from the silvery sea  
To them the sailor's wakeful eye is turning—  
Unchanged they rise, they have not mourn'd for thee.

‘ Couldst thou be shaken from thy radiant place,  
 E’en as a dew-drop from the myrtle spray,  
 Swept by the wind away?  
 Wert thou not peopled by some glorious race?  
 And was there power to smite them with decay?  
 ‘ Then who shall talk of thrones, of sceptres riven?  
 Bow’d be our hearts to think on what *we* are,  
 When from its height afar  
 A World sinks thus—and yon majestic heaven  
 Shines not the less for that one vanish’d star!’

The following, on ‘ The Dying Improvisatore,’ have a rich lyrical cadence, and glow of deep feeling:

‘ Never, oh! never more,  
 On thy Rome’s purple heaven mine eye shall dwell,  
 Or watch the bright waves melt along thy shore—  
 My Italy, farewell!

‘ Alas!—thy hills among,  
 Had I but left a memory of my name,  
 Of love and grief one deep, true, fervent song,  
 Unto immortal fame!

‘ But like a lute’s brief tone,  
 Like a rose-odour on the breezes cast,  
 Like a swift flush of dayspring, seen and gone,  
 So hath my spirit pass’d!

‘ Yet, yet remember me!  
 Friends! that upon its murmurs oft have hung,  
 When from my bosom, joyously and free,  
 The fiery fountain sprung.

‘ Under the dark rich blue  
 Of midnight heavens, and on the star-lit sea,  
 And when woods kindle into spring’s first hue,  
 Sweet friends! remember me!

‘ And in the marble halls,  
 Where life’s full glow the dreams of beauty wear,  
 And poet-thoughts embodied light the walls,  
 Let me be with you there!

‘ Fain would I bind for you  
 My memory with all glorious things to dwell;  
 Fain bid all lovely sounds my name renew—  
 Sweet friends, bright land, farewell!’

But we must stop here. There would be no end of our extracts, if we were to yield to the temptation of noting down every beautiful passage which arrests us in turning over the leaves of the volumes before us. We ought to recollect, too, that there are few to whom our pages are likely to come, who are not al-

ready familiar with their beauties; and, in fact, we have made these extracts, less with the presumptuous belief that we are introducing Mrs Hemans for the first time to the knowledge or admiration of our readers, than from a desire of illustrating, by means of them, the singular felicity in the choice and employment of her imagery, of which we have already spoken so much at large;—that fine accord she has established between the world of sense and of soul—that delicate blending of our deep inward emotions with their splendid symbols and emblems without.

We have seen too much of the perishable nature of modern literary fame, to venture to predict to Mrs Hemans that hers will be immortal, or even of very long duration. Since the beginning of our critical career, we have seen a vast deal of beautiful poetry pass into oblivion, in spite of our feeble efforts to recall or retain it in remembrance. The tuneful quartos of Southey are already little better than lumber:—And the rich melodies of Keats and Shelley,—and the fantastical emphasis of Wordsworth,—and the plebeian pathos of Crabbe, are melting fast from the fields of our vision. The novels of Scott have put out his poetry. Even the splendid strains of Moore are fading into distance and dimness, except where they have been married to immortal music; and the blazing star of Byron himself is receding from its place of pride. We need say nothing of Milman, and Croly, and Atherstone, and Hood, and a legion of others, who, with no ordinary gifts of taste and fancy, have not so properly survived their fame, as been excluded by some hard fatality from what seemed their just inheritance. The two who have the longest withstood this rapid withering of the laurel, and with the least marks of decay on their branches, are Rogers and Campbell; neither of them, it may be remarked, voluminous writers, and both distinguished rather for the fine taste and consummate elegance of their writings, than for that fiery passion, and disdainful vehemence, which seemed for a time to be so much more in favour with the public.

If taste and elegance, however, be titles to enduring fame, we might venture securely to promise that rich boon to the author before us; who adds to those great merits a tenderness and loftiness of feeling, and an ethereal purity of sentiment, which could only emanate from the soul of a woman. She must beware of becoming too voluminous; and must not venture again on any thing so long as the 'Forest Sanctuary.' But, if the next generation inherits our taste for short poems, we are persuaded it will not readily allow her to be forgotten. For we do not hesitate to say, that she is, beyond all comparison, the most touching and accomplished writer of occasional verses that our literature has yet to boast of.

- ART. III.—1. *Enquête sur les Fers*. 4to, pp. 368. Paris, 1829.
2. *Enquête sur les Sucres*. 4to, pp. 324. Paris, 1829.
3. *De L'Enquête sur les Fers, et des Conditions du Bon Marché permanent des Fers en France*, par J. J. Baude. 8vo, pp. 89. Paris, 1829.
4. *De L'Enquête sur les Fers*, par M. Anisson Dupéron. 8vo, pp. 57. Paris, 1829.
5. *Mémoire sur le Tarif des Sucres*, par les Raffineurs de Sucre de Paris. 4to, pp. 72. Paris, 1828.
6. *Observations Adressées à la Commission D'Enquête*, par le Délégué de la Chambre de Commerce de Lyon. 4to, pp. 12. Lyon, 1829.
7. *Mémoire à son Excellence le Ministre du Commerce, &c.* par les Fabricans D'Etoffes de Soie de la Ville de Lyon. 4to, pp. 46. Lyon, 1829.
8. *The Manufactures and Commerce of Lyons, translated from the French of Charles Dupin*. 12mo, pp. 26. Coventry, 1829.
9. *Rapport de la Commission Libre, nommée par les Manufacturiers et Negocians de Paris, sur l'Enquête relative à l'état actuel de l'industrie du Coton en France*. 8vo, pp. 238. Paris, 1829.
10. *Situation de l'Industrie Cotonnière en France, en 1828*, par M. Singer, ex-Negociant-manufacturier. 8vo, pp. 108. Paris, 1829.
11. *Pétition des Propriétaires de Vignes, du Département de la Gironde, Adressée aux Chambres, et Mémoire à l'Appui*. 4to, pp. 10 and 75. Bordeaux, 1828.
12. *Recherches Statistiques sur les Forêts de la France*, par Faisseau Lavanne. 4to, pp. 100. Paris, 1829.

THE commercial policy of France, and the effects which it has already had, and promises to have, on her industry, and the condition of her people, have recently begun to attract a good deal of attention on this side the Channel. And we can truly say, that there are few subjects that are more worthy of being studied. The policy in question is exerting a most powerful influence over the fortunes of *thirty-two millions* of people; and would, therefore, though it were in other respects wholly alien to us, be an object of rational curiosity and investigation. Such, however, is not really the case. Our interest in the experiments now going on in France, is that rather of parties than spectators. The policy pursued by her government had long the ascendancy in this country; and it is said by many, that the difficulties in which we have recently been involved, are

wholly to be ascribed to our having, in some degree, relaxed the old prohibitive system, and begun to act on more enlarged and liberal principles. Under these circumstances, it becomes of the greatest importance to look at the effects that the exclusive system is producing in France. Her government has, for a lengthened period, never hesitated about granting all the protection to every class of producers that it thought fit to require. If a duty of 100 per cent on importation from abroad, was not sufficient to exclude foreign competition, the duty was increased to 200, or 500 per cent, or the article was wholly prohibited ! M. de Saint-Cricq was a minister after the good old fashion ; restrictions, prohibitions, and bounties being, in his estimation, the genuine sources of national power and prosperity, and the freedom of industry the most certain cause of their decline. The commerce and industry of France have not been sacrificed to ‘a rage for experiments,’ and ‘newfangled theories.’ Whatever may happen to them, her ministers, from the era of the First-Consulship downwards, are entitled to affirm, that they have acted according to the most approved principles of the mercantile system,—that had its most strenuous English supporters been in their place, they could not have done more.

It becomes, therefore, of the greatest consequence to inquire into the actual results of this system. Are the manufactures and commerce of France in a flourishing condition ? Have the people a ready market for their produce ? Are they, in these respects, satisfied with their condition ?

We unhesitatingly aver, that every one of these questions must be answered in the negative. There is not a single branch of manufactures or commerce that is, at this moment, in a flourishing condition. Even the businesses that have been fenced round with prohibitions, are in any thing but a thriving state ; while wine, brandy, and silk, the leading products of France, and the materials by which she formerly carried on a lucrative and extensive foreign commerce, meet with no profitable outlet, and have become almost unsaleable. The distress in the southern departments is alike general and severe. And instead of being satisfied with their condition, the leading merchants of Paris, Bordeaux, and other great towns, as well as vast numbers of the agriculturists, have petitioned for the repeal or modification of the prohibitive system ; which, how inexplicable soever it may appear to its admirers, they have denounced as ‘a most deplorable error,’ and as being totally subversive of the national prosperity.

Napoleon was the great practical apostle of that School of



which Mr Sadler is the present oracle. During his ascendancy, he adopted every means in his power to exclude foreign manufactured goods from France, and to render her independent of extrinsic supplies. We believe it would not be difficult to show, that this policy contributed powerfully to accelerate his downfall; and it would seem as if it were, in some measure, from gratitude for its influence in this respect, that it has been so religiously followed by his successors. No doubt there were circumstances that might have justified their interfering, to some extent, to lessen the suddenness and violence of the shock that would, most probably, have been experienced, had they adopted a totally different line of policy immediately upon the restoration. The 'Continental system' had either given birth to, or occasioned the growth and extension of, several branches of industry, for the successful prosecution of which France has no natural capabilities, and which would, consequently, have been exposed to the most imminent hazard, had that system been subverted. The establishments for the manufacture of sugar from beet root may be quoted as an example of this. Had colonial and foreign sugars been admitted for home consumption at a reasonable duty, their ruin must have been instantly completed; and though there neither is nor can be any reason why a system, which imposes a heavy burden on the entire kingdom, should be indefinitely continued, for the sake of the small body of individuals engaged in the beet root manufacture, still it might have been advisable, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, that the duties on foreign and colonial sugars should not have been reduced to their proper level at once, but gradually. The iron trade had also, partly from the obstructions thrown in the way of importation by the war, and partly from the great demand it occasioned for warlike instruments, been greatly extended during its continuance. At the termination of hostilities it was necessarily, therefore, exposed to a double difficulty; for, in the first place, it had to apprehend a renewal of competition from abroad; and, in the second place, it was necessary that a considerable change should take place in the species of articles produced, and that the manufacture of ploughs and other useful implements should supersede that of cannons, muskets, &c. In this, as in the former case, government might have been warranted, in the view of lessening the inconvenience arising from any sudden change, in enacting that the duties on iron existing in 1814 should have sustained no immediate diminution; they being, however, made to decrease progressively, till the trade had either become entirely free, or the duty had ceased to be burdensome to the na-

tional industry. A similar policy might have been followed with respect to the importation of cottons, cloths, &c. The prohibitive system should have been gradually, but slowly relaxed; so that as little injury as possible might have been inflicted upon those who had unwarily embarked their capital under the idea that it was to be permanent; at the same time that some relief was given to the public from the oppressive burdens it entailed on them, and that a guarantee was obtained that it would, at no very distant period, be wholly abolished.

This was the course that common sense, and a regard for the most obvious principles of justice and policy, would have pointed out; but it was not the course followed by the ministers of Louis. They improved on the system of Napoleon. He knew that buying and selling are, in commerce, what action and reaction are in physics, equal and contrary; and that it was impossible to exclude foreign produce from the markets of France, without, at the same time, putting an end to the importation of French produce into foreign countries. But M. de St Cricq and his colleagues believed, that objects so utterly incompatible might be reconciled; and they therefore set about giving to the 'Continental system' an extension of which Napoleon had never dreamed,—at the very moment that they were proclaiming their anxiety to extend the trade and navigation of the country. The duty on foreign iron had continued stationary from 1790, at the rate of two francs twenty cents the quintal (220 lbs.); in 1814, however, it was raised, under pretence of protecting the iron masters from the competition with which they were then threatened, to fifteen francs, being an increase of nearly *seven* times its previous amount. But even this was not found sufficient to secure the iron masters that monopoly which they were naturally anxious to obtain; and, in 1822, the duty was again raised from fifteen to twenty-five francs the quintal, making, in all, the enormous addition of about 1136 per cent to the duties existing in 1814!

This system has been acted upon throughout. During the war, the islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe had sustained almost irreparable injury, and the sugar produced in them and in French Guiana had been reduced to a mere trifle. '*La restauration nous rendit nos colonies; les cultures s'y trouvaient ruinées, et les planteurs écrasés de dettes.*'—(*Enquête sur les Sucres*, p. 225.) Here, then, was a peculiarly favourable opportunity for getting rid of the colonial monopoly. A moderate duty might have been laid, for the sake of revenue, on all foreign sugar imported into France, while a temporary exemption from such duty was granted to the sugar manufactured at home. But this plan was

far too simple and obviously useful to be approved by government. Instead of endeavouring to promote, to the utmost of their power, the interests of the thirty-two millions of French citizens committed to their care, by enabling them to obtain so indispensable an article as sugar at the lowest price, they resolved to sacrifice them, in order, be it observed, not to protect, but to *raise anew*, a West India interest, consisting of the planters and negroes of Martinique, Guadeloupe, and the Isle de Bourbon. In furtherance of this statesmanlike object, a discriminating duty of twenty francs the quintal was laid, in 1814, on all sugar imported from any foreign country or colony, over and above that which was laid on sugar imported from the French colonies. In 1816 this discriminating duty was raised to twenty-five francs; in 1820 to thirty francs; and in 1822 to fifty francs; the duty being then fixed at forty-five francs the quintal on sugar of the growth of the French colonies, and at ninety-five francs on sugar of foreign growth.

Had the French islands been naturally as productive as the colonies of other powers, this system would have been less objectionable. Such, however, is very far from being the case. It is proved by evidence, taken before the *Commission d'Enquête*, that while the French West India islands do not, at an average, yield more than 2500 or 3000 kilogrammes\* the hectare, Cuba and Porto-Rico yield from 6000 to 7000. Thus, then, it is obvious that, in order to cause capital to be carried from France, and employed in the renewal of sugar plantations in two small and comparatively barren islands at the opposite side of the Atlantic, which, if war were to break out between France and England, would be wrested from the former within less than six months, the government has doubled the price of all the sugar consumed in France; imposing, exclusive of many other pernicious consequences, a direct pecuniary burden on the consumers, which, as we shall afterwards show, may be fairly estimated at L.1,400,000 a-year.

During the ascendancy of Napoleon, France comprised the kingdom of the Netherlands, while the whole of Italy and the best part of Germany were open to her exports. Although, therefore, the intercourse she had formerly carried on by sea with foreign countries was almost entirely put an end to, her wines, silks, and other products, met with a ready and extensive sale in the Continental markets. But when Napoleon had been overthrown, and France reduced within her ancient

---

\* The kilogramme is equal to 2 lbs. 3½ oz. (2.2) avoirdupois.

limits, an end was put to the free intercourse she had previously carried on with the countries contiguous to her land frontier. Here, indeed, she seems to have been the first to set a bad example. The Swiss had been in the habit of annually sending great numbers of lean cattle into France; but the government of the latter, no less anxious to protect the interests of the landowners than of the iron-masters, immediately closed their frontier to the cattle of Switzerland: and the Swiss, not being Christians enough to return good for evil, retaliated by increasing the duty on French wines, silks, &c., so as to render it almost prohibitory. The same thing was done with many other articles. The linens, to give only one example, which the Germans had been in the habit of freely importing into France during the 'Empire,' were now loaded with prohibitory duties; which were avenged by the imposition of similar duties on French products imported into Germany.—Let us now see what have been the actual results of this system.

I. The excessively high duties laid on the importation of foreign iron into France, in 1814 and 1822, have, by reducing the imports from abroad, and raising the price of iron at home to a comparatively high level, attracted a great deal of capital to the iron trade, and occasioned its rapid extension. In 1818, the quantity of unwrought iron produced in France, was estimated at 1,140,000 metrical quintals; in 1825, it had increased to 1,976,000; and is now supposed to amount to 2,269,000 quintals. There are now 393 blast-furnaces in France, in fourteen of which coal is made use of; while, in 1819, there were only 290 furnaces, none of which used coal. Thus far, therefore, the exclusive system has succeeded.

But the high duty has not merely extended the production of iron in France: It has, at the same time, added greatly to its price, and to the price of timber. Had foreign iron been altogether excluded, there might have been some difficulty in determining the average rise of price occasioned by the duty; but as there are still from 80,000 to 90,000 quintals of foreign iron imported, the greater part of which pays a duty of twenty-five francs, it is obvious that, at an average, the price of the whole 2,269,000 quintals of iron produced in France, must be increased in about the same proportion; but, taking the average at only twenty francs the quintal, it will make, on the above-mentioned quantity, a sum of 40,538,800 francs, or L.1,621,520; being the *direct* cost of the protection granted to the native iron masters. And as the whole number of persons employed in this department of the iron trade, is not supposed to exceed

80,000, it follows, that the premium paid them amounts, at an average, to twenty pounds a-piece.

But notwithstanding this immense bonus, the iron masters are at present in a very depressed condition. It must have been evident, indeed, to every one who knew any thing of the subject, that the stimulus given to the manufacture, by the enormous additions made to the duties in 1814 and 1822, could not be permanent; and that, after as much capital had been attracted from other less-favoured businesses, as might be necessary to furnish the required supply of iron, the profits, and other emoluments of those engaged in the trade, would be reduced to the common level. A circumstance which might have been foreseen from the beginning, but which appears to have been wholly overlooked when the duties were originally proposed, has powerfully contributed to bring about this result, at the same time that it has entailed a heavy additional burden on the public. Nineteen out of twenty parts of all the iron produced in France, are prepared by means of wood; and the multiplication of furnaces, consequent to the augmentation of the duties, has had a wonderful influence on the price of this most important article. The evidence given before the Commission is quite decisive as to this point. In Champagne, for example, the *chord* of wood, which sold in 1819, 20, and 21, at from three fr., to three fr. fifty cents, sold in 1826 at from nine to ten francs.—(*Enquête sur les Fers*, p. 61.) At Chatillon-sur-Seine, the *banne* of charcoal, which had cost sixteen francs in 1822, cost twenty-three francs fifty cents in 1827.—(p. 79.) A similar rise has taken place everywhere. In the Ardennes, the *chord* of wood, which brought only from seven to eight francs in 1821, fetches at present from twelve to thirteen francs. And the produce of the sales of wood on account of the state, which amounted, in 1818, to 20,181,000 francs, had, in 1828, increased to 29,309,000 francs.

According to the evidence taken before the Commission, the production of iron is not, in consequence of this extraordinary rise in the price of wood, more profitable at this moment, than it was in 1822, before the duties were raised from fifteen to twenty-five francs. M. Heron de Villefosse is of opinion, that the iron masters of the department of the Haute-Saône cannot obtain the same profits now, that they realised previously to the rise in the price of wood; unless they get sixty-nine francs for the same quantity of iron they formerly sold at from fifty to fifty-five francs. The charcoal which was, previously to 1822, supposed to form an item of eighteen francs in the cost of a metrical quintal of iron, now forms an item of thirty-two francs.

M. Muel Doublat, an extensive iron-founder at Abainville, in the department of the Meuse, informed the Commission, 'We made some profits when prices were at forty-five francs, and now we lose when we sell at fifty francs.' The witness was speaking of an inferior quality of iron. 'The reason is, that in 1819, the *banne* of charcoal cost eighteen francs three cents, whereas it costs at present thirty-seven francs fifty cents.'—(*Enquête*, p. 66.)

The exclusion of foreign iron has not, therefore, had the single effect of adding from twenty-five to fifty per cent to the cost of that most useful metal; it has also had the effect of adding from twenty-five to fifty per cent to the price of wood. And if we reflect that wood forms the sole article of fuel throughout almost all France, we shall be able to form a faint idea of the oppressiveness of the burden it must impose on the country. The proprietors of forests are, indeed, the only persons that have reaped the smallest advantage from the prohibitory duties of 1814 and 1822.

Our object, say the government and legislators, is to render France a great manufacturing country; and they endeavour to accomplish this object by making immense additions to the cost of wood and iron,—the principal means and instruments by which manufacturing industry is carried on! Even the iron masters went so far as to admit, that the additional duty which they claimed and obtained in 1822, would add fifty francs, or 40 shillings, to the price of a plough. Perhaps, indeed, it was supposed that the rise would affect only agricultural implements, and was therefore looked upon as of inferior importance. It could not, however, be thus limited in its operation. M. Calla, an extensive machine-maker and iron-founder at Paris, was examined by the Commission. In answer to some questions put to him, he stated, that the price at which he could afford to sell a cotton-spinning machine, of a certain number of spindles, was 2700 francs, and that the same machine might be bought in England for 1900 francs, or about *two-thirds* of the sum which it cost in France.—(*Enquête*, p. 106.) M. Calla showed, that a good deal of this difference was to be ascribed to the greater skill of the English mechanists, originating in the greater extent to which the division of labour was carried in this country, in consequence of the greater demand for machines; and he justly added, that one of the most effectual means of increasing the demand for such machines in France, and lowering their price, would be to reduce the duties on the raw material of which they are made. Yet it is by enforcing such a system that the Sadlers of France imagine they will be able to place her cotton, and

other manufactures, in a condition to withstand the competition of the English; and so true is it, that

*Un sot trouve toujours un plus sot qui l'admire,*

that the example of these sages is held up as worthy of being imitated by the Parliament of England!

The truth is, that had the object of the government been to depress the industry of the people, and prevent its establishment on a solid foundation, they could hardly have hit upon any system of policy better calculated to attain their object, than that which they have adopted. The superior richness of our coal mines, their advantageous situation, and the facilities afforded for the conveyance of coal and ore from place to place, by our improved roads and canals, give us advantages in the iron manufacture with which France will never be able to contend. On M. Martin, an iron-founder at Rouen, being asked by the Commission, to what he ascribed the high price of machinery in France, compared with its price in England, he replied, *J'attribue cette plus grande cherté à ce que le combustible, les limes, l'acier, TOUT LE MATERIEL ENTIN DE LA FABRICATION EST TROIS FOIS PLUS CHER EN FRANCE QU'EN ANGLETERRE.*—

(*Enquête*, p. 155.) An enlightened government, anxious for the advancement of its subjects in the career of wealth and civilisation, would not have made them waste their energies in attempting to overcome obstacles that are really insurmountable; and, instead of endeavouring to force the production of iron at home, would have gladly imported it from wheresoever it might have been procured at the lowest cost. It is difficult to say whether the present system be most injurious by raising the price of iron, or by preventing improvements in its manufacture. It would be idle, indeed, to imagine, that any very rapid progress should be made in the details of a business fenced round by prohibitions, and protected from competition. ‘*Je ne vois pas,*’ says M. Martin, ‘*que depuis sept ans que le droit protege la fabrication de la fonte francaise, les qualités se soient améliorés; et deslors, je doute qu’un tel resultat puisse être prochainement obtenu.*’—(*Enquête*, p. 154.) And a very well-informed writer in the *Révue Trimestrielle*, (No. II. p. 467,) nowise inclined to depreciate the industry of his countrymen, has stated, that the form and construction of furnaces in France are such as to excite an emotion of pity; that they are speedily worn out and rendered useless; and that they do not, while working, yield one-third part of the iron that is yielded by an English furnace.

So much as to the direct operation of the restrictions on the iron trade: Let us now briefly look at the operation of those on the colony trade.

II. The discriminating duty of fifty francs the quintal laid on all foreign sugars imported into France, has, by raising the price of French sugars, had the same effect in stimulating the cultivation of Martinique, Guadeloupe, and the Isle de Bourbon, that the duty on foreign iron has had in multiplying furnaces. The importations from Guadeloupe, which had in 1818 amounted to twenty-four millions of kilogrammes, had, in 1827, increased to thirty-two millions. Martinique, which imported only eighteen millions in 1822, imported twenty-seven millions in 1828; and the Isle de Bourbon, which had produced only from four to five millions of kilogrammes in 1820, exported from twelve to thirteen millions in 1828. To this extent, therefore, the system has succeeded; and its patrons may congratulate themselves on the fact, that, notwithstanding Martinique and Guadeloupe do not yield, at an average, above one-third the produce that would be obtained from an equal outlay of capital in Cuba or Porto-Rico, they have succeeded in obtaining for them and the Isle de Bourbon a complete monopoly of the French markets.

It appears from the official accounts laid before the Commission, that the total quantity of colonial and foreign sugar imported into France, for home consumption, in 1826 and 1827, amounted, at an average, to 65,890,723 kilogrammes, or 658,907 quintals. But the *discriminating* duty on foreign sugar being, as we have already seen, fifty francs the quintal, it follows, that its imposition must make an equivalent addition to the price of sugar; or that it must impose an annual charge on the consumers of sugar in France of no less than 32,945,000 francs, (L.1,318,000,) over and above what they would have to pay, were the same duty laid on the foreign sugar imported into France that is laid on the sugar of her colonies.

This, however, is not the whole sum which its truly *precious* colonies cost France. From 1822 to 1826, a drawback, equivalent to the duty, was allowed on the exportation of French sugars; but owing to their high price, exclusive of the duty, none of them could be exported—the cheaper sugars of Brazil, Cuba, &c., having the entire possession of the Continental markets. M. de St Cricq was, however, determined that his friends, the planters of Martinique and Guadeloupe, besides enjoying a monopoly of the supply of France, should be in a condition to offer their sugar on the same terms as the Brazilians in foreign markets. For this purpose, a law was enacted in 1826, by which the drawback granted to the exporters of French sugars was made equivalent not only to the duty charged on them, but also to the computed difference between their natural cost, and the cost of the sugars of Brazil and Cuba. It is admitted, in



the Papers before us, that the bounty thus paid on the exportation of French sugars is equal to 22 francs 54 cents the quintal ; and as about 700,000 quintals were exported in 1828, the burden thus laid on France must amount to 1,577,800 francs, or L.63,112.

The increased price of sugar resulting from this most preposterous system, has reduced its consumption in France to less, we believe, than a *third* part of what it would otherwise be. To show its influence in this respect, we subjoin the following official statements of the consumption of sugar in France and Great Britain, during the last eight years.

Years.	Sugar consumed in France, kilog.	Sugar consumed in France, lbs.	Sugar consumed in Great Britain, lbs.
1820 .	48,616,751 .	106,956,852 .	289,100,672
21 .	46,439,327 .	102,166,519 .	299,742,688
22 .	55,481,004 .	122,058,208 .	293,272,880
23 .	41,542,856 .	91,394,832 .	318,379,712
24 .	60,031,122 .	132,068,468 .	331,213,232
25 .	56,080,506 .	123,377,113 .	297,467,408
26 .	71,463,816 .	157,220,395 .	364,568,400
27 .	60,317,631 .	132,698,788 .	338,374,392

Now, it appears from this statement, that the average quantity of sugar consumed in 1826 and 1827, amounted to only 144,959,591 lbs., while the average quantity consumed in Great Britain during the same years, amounted to 351,370,896 lbs. It is essential, too, to bear in mind, that the population of France is known to exceed thirty-two millions, while that of Great Britain does not probably exceed fifteen and a half, and is certainly under sixteen millions. Hence it appears, that *the people of this country, though only half as numerous as the people of France, consume about two and a half times the quantity of sugar* ; or, in other words, an Englishman consumes, at an average, about *five* times as much sugar as a Frenchman ! A part of this extraordinary discrepancy must, no doubt, be ascribed to the greater opulence of the people of this country, and the prevailing use of sugared tea ; but there can be no question, that it is principally to be ascribed to the miserable policy of the French government, in imposing such oppressive discriminating duties on foreign sugars. Those who are best qualified to decide as to such a point, seem to be universally of opinion, that were the discriminating duty abolished, and all sugars admitted into France on payment of the same moderate duty of 45 francs the quintal, (nearly 1½d. per lb.) the consumption would be at least doubled. And it appears pretty certain, that this estimate is rather under than over-rated ; for, though the consumption were increased

to the extent supposed, it would not give half the quantity to each individual in France, that is consumed by each in Britain.

It may, therefore, be concluded, that the system of the government of France, as to the sugar trade, costs her a direct pecuniary sacrifice of about L.1,400,000 a-year; reducing, at the same time, the consumption of sugar to less than a half of what it would otherwise be; and forcing a Frenchman to content himself with only *one* pound, when an Englishman gets *five*.

It should, however, be stated, that besides causing immense sums to be laid out on Martinique and Guadeloupe, France is indebted for the beet-root cultivation to this system. Here, indeed, as in most other instances, the government of the Bourbons is but the servile copyist of that of Napoleon. The beet-root plantations began during the 'Continental system,' and were warmly patronised by the Emperor, who firmly believed, consistently with the approved dogmas of the mercantile school, that no better method could be found of enriching his subjects, than by making them pay a couple of shillings for sugar raised from beet-root at home, which they might have imported from abroad for sixpence. After the overthrow of Napoleon, a severe check was given to this novel branch of industry; but it began to gather new strength with the additions made to the duties on foreign sugar in 1818 and 1820, and has increased rapidly since 1822, when the duty was raised to 95 francs the quintal, or to nearly fourpence a-pound.

M. de Brunfaut, Professor of Chemistry, informed the Commission that there were one hundred and one establishments for the preparation of sugar from beet-root in activity, towards the end of last year; and he estimates the sugar produced by them at 4,835,000 kilog., or 10,637,000 lbs. So rapid, indeed, if we may believe this witness, is the progress of the manufacture, that he supposes that a hundred new establishments will be founded during the present year; and that in *five* years only, the indigenous sugar will suffice for the home consumption of France. But those who are engaged in the trade are less sanguine; and suppose that ten or even twenty years will have to elapse before beet-root sugar will suffice for the home consumption. In the meantime, however, they all agree, that any modification of the duties on West India sugar would be fatal to the beet-root cultivation.

It is stated, by some of those engaged in the business, that beet-root sugar costs the producers, every thing included, from 80 to 86 cents the kilog.; but they naturally enough look forward to a considerable reduction in its price, according as the

processes and details of the manufacture come to be better understood, and more extensively practised. The sugar of Martinique and Guadeloupe is said to cost the planters from 60 to 65 cents the kilog.; so that it does not seem at all improbable that the beet-root manufacturers may be able to beat the French West Indians out of the field. But sugar may be produced in Brazil for less than 30 cents the kilog., or little more than the third of what it takes to produce beet-root sugar; and we confess, notwithstanding all that the chemical Professor M. Brunfaut says to the contrary, that we see but little reason to expect that beet-root sugar will ever be produced so cheaply.

Supposing, however, that the anticipations of the producers of beet-root sugar are so far realized, that ultimately it gets an ascendancy over the sugar of the French West Indies, and becomes adequate to furnish France with the quantity with which she is now supplied, it may be worth while to reflect a little on the cost which she will have incurred in bringing about this result. We shall suppose that the consummation may be effected in the short space of eleven years, or that in 1840, beet-root sugar will be able to bear the same duty as the sugar of Martinique and Guadeloupe; but that until then, it is necessary that it should enjoy a complete exemption from all duties; or that the present system should be preserved entire. Now, it will be observed, that the forcing plan began so early as 1807; but let us look only at its expense since 1820. We have already seen, that the discriminating duty on foreign sugars, without which, it is admitted on all hands that neither the French West Indians, nor the beet-root raisers, could prosecute their businesses for a single day, costs France, at an average, besides its other pernicious consequences, L.1,400,000 a-year; and supposing this sacrifice to be continued till 1840, it will have amounted to the enormous sum of L.28,000,000 sterling; the *interest* of which at five per cent, supposing it were expended on sugar at 2½d. a-pound, would buy no less than 126,000,000 lbs. a-year! Such, *if* the beet-root cultivation do succeed, is the sacrifice which, according to the most moderate estimate, it will have cost France. Martinique, Guadeloupe, and the Isle de Bourbon, will be rendered useless; and a sum will have been laid out in cradling this artificial branch of industry, that would have furnished nearly as large a supply of sugar to France in all time to come, as is now made use of in that kingdom. Such are the blessings which the 'Continental system' showers on the heads of its worshippers. We hope France will entertain a just sense of their value and importance.

III. But to get a correct notion of the advantages which this system has really conferred on France, we must look, it is said, to the progress and extension of the cotton manufacture. In 1806, it was confined within the narrowest limits; but, owing to the protection it has since enjoyed, about 25,000,000 lbs. of raw cotton were imported for home consumption in 1810; and at present the imports amount to between 80 and 90 millions of lbs. Is it possible, it is asked, to question the policy of a system productive of such results?

But the truth is, that the extension of the cotton manufacture is no better proof of the advantageousness of the forcing plan than the extension of the iron trade. A branch of industry may be extended by means of the superior natural advantages enjoyed by those who carry it on; or by their superior industry and invention; or it may be extended by means of a monopoly,—the consumers being compelled either to want the article altogether, or to pay an artificially enhanced price for it. Had the extension of the cotton manufacture been the result of the operation of either of the first-mentioned circumstances, it would have been highly advantageous. This, however, is not the case. It is not the result of superior natural or acquired capacities, but of custom-house regulations. It has not been extended, because the manufacturers could furnish their countrymen with as good and as cheap articles as they might have imported from abroad. So far from this being the case, it is admitted, on all hands, that the cotton-stuffs manufactured in France cost, at an average, about three times as much as they might be obtained for from England. Of every sum of twenty francs paid by the French people for cottons, ten francs is, in fact, a premium or bonus paid to the manufacturers, to enable them to carry on their business. If a monopoly of this sort enriches France, it must do so by making those who use cottons pay double prices. This principle once admitted, the East India Company will have little difficulty in showing, that their monopoly of the tea trade is a copious source of wealth to the people of Britain.

But while the prohibition of the importation of foreign cottons imposes a burden of several millions a-year on the people of France, it is of no real advantage to the manufacturers. It was beneficial to them during the period when the cottons they produced were not sufficient to supply the home demand; but now that they do this, and that a reaction has taken place, the manufactures are involved in difficulties from which there is hardly any prospect of their ever escaping. ‘*La malaise*,’ say the Commission named by the cotton manufacturers, ‘*qui tour-*

‘*mente l’industrie du coton, est un fait malheureusement trop évident : nos ateliers se ferment, nos produits sont avilis, et lorsque les effets de cet état critique se prolongent, nous envisageons avec anxiété non seulement la ruine prochaine de nos chefs d’établissement, mais encore l’avenir de huit cent mille ouvriers qui vivent de la fabrique du coton.\**

We may observe, by the way, that the number of persons represented in this statement, as being employed in the cotton trade, is grossly exaggerated ; but, in other respects, it is true to the letter. Owing to the stimulus afforded, in the first instance, by the prohibitive system, and the high profits that were for a while realized by those engaged in the trade, so much capital has been attracted to it, and so large a supply of goods produced, that the markets of France are quite overloaded. But to export, is all but impossible. The commercial system of Napoleon and his successors, though omnipotent in France, does not extend to foreign countries. The Parisians must, but the Prussians and South Americans will not, buy French cottons when they can get those of England for less than half the price. And the consequence is, that notwithstanding the immediate contiguity of France to some important markets, her exports are only valued at 22,000,000 francs, or L.880,000, being about the one-twenty-fifth part of those of this country.

Had the French government restricted their efforts to the encouragement of the weaving of cotton, they might, perhaps, have succeeded. But they would not be satisfied with any thing short of the whole manufacture ; and in grasping at too much, it is most probable they will lose all. The difficulties with which the carders and spinners of France have to contend, in consequence of the high price of machinery, fuel, &c. seem quite insurmountable. The committee of manufacturers give the following statement of the expense of erecting and maintaining a spinning-mill, wrought by a steam engine of thirty-horse power :

	In France.	In England.
Cost of a steam-engine constructed on the principle of those of Watt, - -	Francs. 55,000	Francs. 35,000
Cost of the machinery and fittings-up, -	425,000	270,000
Placing the machinery, &c. - - -	20,000	20,000
	<hr/> 500,000	<hr/> 325,000

---

\* *Rapport de la Commission Libre, nommée par les Manufacturiers de Coton.*—Int. p. 6.

	Francs.	Francs.
Interest and wear and tear of capital, ten per cent, - - - - -	50,000	32,500
Rent of a building suitable for such an establishment, - - - - -	12,000	10,000
Fuel, 2½ tons coal a-day, 54 francs at Paris, and 9s. at Manchester, - - - - -	36,500,	8,500
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	98,500	51,000

The manufacturers estimate that such an establishment would spin 400 kilog. a-day, supposing it to work twelve hours; making the expense of spinning 82 cents per kilog. in Paris, and 42 only in Manchester. Coal is, however, a good deal higher-priced in Paris than in some other places in France where manufactures are established; and estimating, with the manufacturers, this excess of price to make an item of eight cents in the cost of spinning a kilog. of cotton in Paris, it would still amount to 74 cents, or to 32 cents more than the cost of spinning it at Manchester.—(*Rapport de la Commission Libre, nommée par les Manufacturiers*, p. 8.)\*

Such is the statement put forth by the French cotton manufacturers, and we see no reason for questioning its accuracy. To call a system, productive of such results, *protective*, is, if any thing can be, an abuse of language. One thing, however, is certain, that so long as the French manufacturers are favoured with this sort of protection, their competition with us in any free market will be of no more importance than would be that of the Esquimaux. If we were hostile to France, we should rejoice in her having identified herself with such a system. But we disclaim being actuated by any such feelings. We are truly anxious for her prosperity, for her sake and our own; for unless she be surrounded by Bishop Berkeley's wall of brass, whatever contributes to increase her wealth, must in some degree redound to the advantage of her neighbours. And we therefore venture to hope, that her rulers will at length see reason to renounce a system which is a public nuisance; and which has no recommendation, except that it inevitably inflicts ten times more injury on those by whom it is enforced, than on any one else.

---

\* At St Etienne, where the French iron manufacture is carried on under circumstances which approach the nearest to those under which it is carried on in England, the expenses are estimated at about double, or in the proportion of 130 to 65. See the *brochure* of M. J. J. Baudé, p. 50.

There is not the faintest prospect, whatever devices may be resorted to, that the French will ever be able to rival us in the spinning of cotton; but were they to allow foreign yarn to be freely imported, and at the same time to repeal the oppressive duties on iron and machinery, we do not know but that they might, at no very distant period perhaps, be able to stand a competition with us in the business of weaving. Our superiority, in this branch of the manufacture, is by no means so decided as in the other. Were the French, then, to cease contending with us in both departments, and to limit their efforts to that in which they are more nearly on a level, the competition would be much keener and closer; and the single branch of the manufacture that would remain to them, would be ten times more advantageous than the whole is, in the mode in which it is now carried on.

The exclusion of foreign cotton yarn from France is an error of the same sort that we committed in excluding foreign *thrown* silk from this country, or rather, loading it with the enormous duty of 14s. 7½d. a-lb. The whole manufacture was, in this way, oppressed, in order that the least important branch of it might be bolstered up. Had the importation of foreign thrown silk been free, or had it been loaded only with the same duty as the thrown silk imported into France, we believe our superiority in the silk manufacture would, at present, have been quite as decided as in the cotton.

IV. The effects of this system, in its application to the linen trade, have been precisely analogous. The value of the foreign linen imported into France, in 1822, amounted to 36,000,000 francs (L.1,440,000). In that year, however, the duty was raised so as to be almost prohibitory; and the Netherlanders, Prussians, and Germans, no longer able to dispose of their goods in France, were obliged to resort to other markets. It is of importance, too, to observe, that this measure has entirely disappointed the expectations of the manufacturers. The high price of the linens made at home, prevented them from being used in the place of those that were excluded; and obliged the consumers of linens to endeavour to fill up their place, as well as they could, with cottons. Previously to 1822, France had been a considerable *entrepôt* for foreign linens; and she had also carried on a considerable trade in bleaching and dyeing them for exportation. Now, however, she has lost all these advantages. Thus an inconsiderable extension of the cotton manufacture has been purchased by the sacrifice of an extremely beneficial trade, amounting to nearly a million and a half a-year; together with the advantages derived from the *entrepôt* for foreign linens, and the employment of labour upon them.

We believe we have already said more than enough to show, that the restrictions imposed on the importation of foreign iron, sugar, and other products, into France, are in the highest degree prejudicial to all her best interests. But we should form a very incomplete idea of the effect of these restrictions, if we supposed it to consist merely in their influence in deteriorating the quality, and raising the price, of the prohibited articles. Their indirect operation is by far the most noxious. By forcing France to raise, at home, articles for the production of which she has no natural or acquired capabilities, they have very greatly narrowed the exportation, and consequently the growth of those articles in the production of which she is superior to every other country. All commerce being bottomed on a fair principle of reciprocity, a country that refuses to import, must cease to export. By excluding foreign produce—by refusing to admit the sugar of Brazil, the cottons and hardware of England, the iron of Sweden, the linens of Germany, and the cattle of Switzerland and Wirtemberg, France has done all that was in her power to drive the merchants of those countries from her markets. They are not less anxious than formerly to obtain her wines, brandies, and silks; inasmuch, however, as commerce is merely an exchange of products, and as France will accept very few of the products belonging to others, they cannot, how anxious soever, maintain that extensive and mutually beneficial intercourse with her they would otherwise carry on: they sell little to her, and their purchases are, of course, proportionally diminished.

This, indeed, is in all cases the necessary and inevitable effect of the prohibitive system. It never fails to lessen exportation to the same extent that it lessens importation; so that when least injurious, it merely substitutes one sort of industry for another—the production of the article that had been obtained from the foreigner, in the place of the production of that which had been sent to him as an equivalent.

It is, we incline to think, unnecessary, notwithstanding Mr Sadler's book has reached a second edition, to set about proving that commerce is a good thing; and that it is better for us to fetch cotton wool from Carolina, sugar from the West Indies, tea from China, and claret from France, than to attempt to raise them, or substitutes for them, directly at home. But deeply as England is indebted to commerce, it is not more advantageous to her than it might be to France. Not only is the latter extremely well situated for carrying on an extensive intercourse with foreign countries, but she is largely supplied with several productions, which, were she to adopt a liberal commercial system, would meet with a ready and advantageous sale abroad, and



enable her to furnish equivalents for the largest amount of imports. The superiority enjoyed by Amboyna in the production of cloves, is not more decided than that enjoyed by France in the production of wine. Her claret, burgundy, champagne, and brandy, are unrivalled; and furnish of themselves the materials of a vast commerce. Indeed, the production of wine is, next to the ordinary business of agriculture, by far the most extensive and valuable branch of industry in France. It is estimated by the landholders and merchants of the department of the Gironde, in the admirable *Pétition et Mémoire à l'Appui*, (No. 11 of the *Pieces* specified at the head of this article,) presented by them to the Chambers, that the quantity of wine annually produced in France, amounts, at an average, to about forty millions of hectolitres, or 1060 millions of gallons; that its value is not less than from 800 to 1000 millions of francs, or from thirty-two to forty millions sterling; and that upwards of *three millions* of individuals are employed in its production. In some of the southern departments, it is of paramount importance. The population of the Gironde, exclusive of the great commercial city of Bordeaux, amounts to 432,839 individuals, of whom no fewer than 226,000 are supposed to be directly engaged in the cultivation of the vine.

Here, then, is a branch of industry in which France has no competitor, which even now affords employment for about a tenth part of her population, and which is susceptible of indefinite extension. The value of the wines, brandies, vinegars, &c. exported from France, at an average of the three years ending with 1790, amounted to about fifty-one millions of francs, or upwards of *two millions* sterling. The annual exports of wine from Bordeaux only, exceeded 100,000 tons; and as the supply of wine might be increased to almost any amount, France has, in this single article, the means of carrying on the most extensive and lucrative commerce. ‘*Le gouvernement français,*’ says M. Chaptal, in his work *Sur l’Industrie Française*, ‘*doit les plus grands encouragements à la culture des vignes, soit qu’il considère ses produits relativement à la consommation intérieure, soit qu’il les envisage sous le rapport de notre commerce avec l’étranger, dont il est en effet la base essentielle.*’

But instead of labouring to extend this great branch of industry, government has not scrupled to sacrifice it to the interests of the iron-founders, and the planters of Martinique and Guadeloupe! They have not killed the goose for the sake of the golden eggs, but for the sake of the offal she had picked up. We do not, indeed, imagine that M. de Saint Cricq was at all aware that such would be the effect of his policy. His is only

one instance, among the myriads that may be specified, to prove that ignorance in a minister is quite as pernicious as bad intentions. The consideration, apparently not a very recondite one, that notwithstanding the bounty of nature, wine was not gratuitously produced in France, and could not, therefore, be exported except for an equivalent, seems never to have occurred to the President of the French Board of Trade. But those whose interests were at stake, did not fail to apprize him that such was really the case. In 1822, when the project for raising the duties on sugar, iron, linens, &c. was under discussion, the merchants of Bordeaux, Nantes, Marseilles, and other great commercial cities, and the wine-growers of the Gironde, and some other departments, presented petitions to the Chambers, in which they truly stated, that it was a contradiction and an absurdity to attempt selling to the foreigner, without, at the same time, buying from him; and expressed their conviction, that the imposition of the duties in question would be fatal to the commerce of France, and would consequently inflict a very serious injury on the wine-growers and silk-manufacturers. These representations did not, however, meet with a very courteous reception. They were stigmatized as the work of ignorant and interested persons. The Chambers approved the policy of ministers; and in their ardour to extend and perfect it, did not hesitate deeply to injure branches of industry on which several millions of persons are dependent, in order that a few comparatively insignificant businesses, nowise suited to France, and supporting 100,000 persons, might be bolstered up and protected!

The event has shown that the anticipations of the merchants were but too well founded. There is a discrepancy in the accounts laid before the Commission by government, and those given in the above-mentioned *Pétition et Mémoire à l'Appui* from the Gironde. M. de Saint Cricq gives no information as to the source whence his information was derived; so that it is impossible to say what degree of credit it is entitled to. According to his tables, the export of wine from France is, at this moment, almost exactly the same as in 1789. It is, however, plain that, had there not been some powerful counteracting cause in operation, the export of wine ought to have been very greatly augmented. The United States, Russia, England, Prussia, and all those countries that have at all times been the great importers of French wines, have made prodigious advances in wealth and population since 1789; and, had the commerce with them not been subjected to injurious restrictions, there is every reason to think that their imports of French wine would have been much greater now than at any former period.

But the truth is, as has been already hinted, that the accounts laid before the Commission by M. de Saint Cricq, are entitled to extremely little credit. In so far as respects the export of wine from Bordeaux, which has always been the great market for this species of produce, the statements in the *Mémoire à l'Appui*, are taken from the custom-house returns. Their accuracy may, therefore, be depended upon, and they show an extraordinary falling off. Previous to the Revolution, the exports amounted to 100,000 tons a-year; but since 1820, they have only been as follows:—

	Tons.		Tons.
1820,	61,110.	1824,	39,625.
1,	63,244.	5,	46,314.
2,	39,955.	6,	48,464.
3,	51,529.	7,	54,492.

It is also stated, (*Mémoire*, p. 33,) that a large proportion of these exports has been made on speculation; and that the markets of Russia, the Netherlands, Hamburg, &c. are glutted with French wines for which there is no demand. ‘Dans ce moment,’ (25 April 1828,) it is said in the *Mémoire*, ‘il existe en consignment, à Hambourg, 12 à 15,000 barriques de vin pour compte des propriétaires du département de la Gironde, qui seront trop heureux s’ils ne perdent que leur capital.’

This extraordinary decline in the foreign demand, has been accompanied by a corresponding glut of the home market, a heavy fall of prices, and the ruin of a great number of merchants and agriculturists. It is estimated, that there were, in April 1828, no fewer than 600,000 tons of wine in the Gironde, for which no outlet could be found; and the glut, in the other departments, is said to have been proportionally great. The fall in the price of wine has reacted on the vineyards, most of which have become quite unsaleable; and a total stop has been put to every sort of improvement. Nor have matters been in the least amended during the current year. On the contrary, they seem to be gradually getting worse. Such is the poverty of the proprietors, that wine is now frequently seized, and sold by the revenue officers in payment of arrears of taxes; and it appears, from some late statements in the *Mémorial Bordelais*, (a newspaper published at Bordeaux,) that the wine so sold has not recently fetched more, at an average, than about two-thirds of the cost of its production!

Such are the effects that the restrictive system of policy has had on the wine trade of France,—on a branch of industry which, as we have already seen, employs *three millions* of people. It is satisfactory, however, to observe, that the landowners and mer-

chants are fully aware of the source of the misery in which they are involved. They know that they are not suffering from hostile or vindictive measures on the part of foreigners, but from the blind and senseless policy of their own government; that they are victims of an attempt to counteract the most obvious principles—to make France produce articles directly at home, which she might obtain from the foreigner in exchange for wine, brandy, &c. at a third or a fourth part of the expense they now cost. They cannot export, because they are not allowed to import. Hence they do not ask for bounties and prohibitions; on the contrary, they disclaim all such quack nostrums; and demand, what can alone be useful to them and beneficial to the country, a free commercial system.

‘ Considéré en lui même,’ say the landowners and merchants of the Gironde, ‘ le systeme prohibitif est la plus déplorable des erreurs. La nature, dans sa variété infinie, a départi à chaque contrée ses attributs particuliers; elle a imprimé sur chaque sol sa véritable destination, et c’est par la diversité des produits et des besoins, qu’elle a voulu unir les hommes, par un lien universel, et operer entre eux ces rapprochements, qui ont produit le commerce et la civilisation.

‘ Quelle est la base du systeme prohibitif? Une véritable chimere qui consiste à essayer de vendre à l’étranger sans acheter de lui.

‘ Quelle est donc la consequence la plus immediate du systeme prohibitif, ou, en d’autres termes, du monopole? C’est que le pays qui est placé sous son empire ne peut vendre ses produits à l’étranger. Le voilà donc refoulé dans lui même; et à l’impossibilité de vendre ce qu’il a de trop, vient se joindre la nécessité de payer plus cher ce qui lui manque.

‘ Notre industrie ne demandoit, pour fructifier, ni la faveur d’un monopole, ni cette foule d’artifices et des secours dont bien d’autres ont imposé le fardeau au pays. Une sage liberté commerciale, une économie politique fondée sur la nature, en rapport avec sa civilisation, en harmonie avec tous les intérêts véritables; telle étoit son seul besoin. Livrée à son essor naturel, elle se seroit étendue d’elle même sur la France de 1814, comme sur celle de 1789; elle auroit formé la plus riche branche de son agriculture; elle auroit fait circuler et dans son sol natal, et dans tout le sol du royaume, une sève de vie et de richesse; elle auroit encore attiré sur nos plages le commerce du monde, et la France, au lieu de s’ériger avec effort en pays manufacturier, auroit reconquis, par la force des choses, une superiorité incontestable comme pays agricole.

‘ Le systeme contraire a prevalu.

‘ La ruine d’un des plus importants départements de la France; la detresse des départements circonvoisins; le deperissement general du Midi; une immense population attaquée dans ses moyens d’existence; un capital enorme compromis; la perspective de ne pouvoir prelever l’impôt sur notre sol appauvri et deponillé; un préjudice immense pour tous les départements dont nous sommes tributaires; un decroisse-

ment rapide dans celles de nos consommations qui profitent au Nord ; la stagnation générale du commerce, avec tous les desastres qu'elle entraîne ; toutes les pertes qu'elle produit, et tous les dommages ou matériels, ou politiques, ou moraux, qui en sont l'inévitable suite ; enfin l'anéantissement de plus en plus irréparable de tous nos anciens rapports commerciaux ; les autres peuples s'enrichissant de nos pertes et développant leur système commerciale sur les débris du nôtre ;

'Tels sont les fruits amers du système dont nous avons été les principales victimes.'—(*Mémoire.*)

This, let it not be forgotten, is the well-authenticated account given by 12,563 landowners and merchants of the *practical* operation and real effect of that very system of policy, which Mr Sadler, and others of that hopeful school, are exerting themselves to recommend to the Parliament of England.

The effect of this precious system upon the silk-trade of France, the most important branch of her *manufacturing* industry, and one in which she had long the superiority, is similar, and hardly less destructive. Her prohibitions have forced others to manufacture for themselves, so that the foreign demand for silks is rapidly diminishing. It is stated, in the *Observations Adressées à la Commission d'Enquête*, (No. 6, at the head of this article,) by the delegate of the Chamber of Commerce of Lyons, that the silk manufacture is in the worst possible state. 'Ce qui doit surtout exciter,' he observes, 'la sollicitude du gouvernement, et le décider à entrer dans nos vues, c'est l'état déplorable, alarmant, de la fabrique de Lyon : les quatre années de 1824 à 1827 offrent sur les quatre années précédentes un déficit qui excède 150 mille kilog. pour les seules expéditions d'Allemagne ; l'année 1828, et l'année courante, 1829, nous donnent une progression décroissante plus effrayante encore,'\* (p. 11.) It is further stated, in a Report by the manufacturers of Lyons, that there were 26,000 looms employed in that city in 1824, while at present there are not more than 15,000. The competition of Switzerland and England has been chiefly instrumental in producing these effects. At Zurich, where there were only 3,000 looms employed in 1815, there are now more than 5,000 ; and at Eberfeld, where there were none in 1815, there are now above 1,000. Switzerland is said to have in all 10,000 looms employed at this moment in the manufacture of plain broad silks.

---

\* Education, according to M. Dupin, is at a very low ebb in Lyons. 'Of the young men of twenty years of age, it was found, in 1827, that of 835 who were examined, 285 could read and write, 329 could only read, and 221 could do neither : In the remainder of the department, of 1,919 young men, 787 could read and write, 139 could only read, and 993 were ignorant of both.'—P. 22.

The distresses and complaints of the wine growers, and of the merchants of all the great towns, though they have not prevailed on ministers to relax in the *felo-de-se* policy in which they have embarked, have induced them to enter into some investigations with respect to its operations. The petitioners were anxious that their statements should be examined by committees of the Chambers. This proposal was not, however, relished by Ministers; but on their recommendation, a Commission was appointed '*pour l'examen des certaines questions de législation commerciale*;' and the first two Pieces named at the head of this article, are the earliest products of its labours. As might be expected, the inquiry is not nearly so efficient as it would have been had it been carried on by a fairly selected Committee of the Chambers. Still, however, the evidence given by the persons examined is very important, and throws a great deal of light on many interesting questions. In selecting the members of the Commission, the minister, of course, took care that the majority should be decidedly favourable to his views; and the real object of the *resumé*, or *compte rendu*, of the evidence, given along with it, is not so much to exhibit a clear view of the points which had been established, as to defend the policy of government. The *compte rendu*, attached to the *Enquête sur les Sucres*, is one of the most miserable specimens of reasoning we have ever seen. A moderate degree of commercial freedom, according to M. Pasquier, is a good thing, but rigid prohibitions are infinitely better! The changes recommended by the Commission are, therefore, of no importance; and, unless the Chambers interpose, France will continue, for an apparently indefinite period, to be blessed by the 'Continental System.'

We, however, entertain very little doubt but that the Chambers will interpose. The distress in the South of France is become so very intense, and affects so numerous and powerful a class, that it is impossible to suppose that their complaints can continue to be disregarded. In fact, if we except the forest proprietors, and the raisers of beet-root sugar, there is not a class in France that is not deeply injured by the existing system. Every department of industry suffers from the high price and bad quality of the machines and other implements made of iron; while, owing to the increased price of timber, the iron-masters are involved in the greatest difficulties, and the whole population is affected by the dearth of fuel. The prohibitory duty on foreign sugar, by giving an artificial stimulus to the beet-root cultivation, threatens the total ruin of that West India interest, to protect which it was imposed. The prohibition of foreign linens, redounds only to the advantage of the cotton trade; and

this again is depressed in consequence of the expensiveness of machinery, and the restrictions on the importation of foreign yarn. In short, the prohibitive system has done almost irreparable injury to France. It has forced her capital into businesses which she cannot carry on with advantage, and in which she is sure, do what she will, to be excelled by others; at the same time that it has essentially injured those great departments in which she is superior to every one else.

Perhaps, however, it will be said, that, specious as this reasoning may appear, it is not conclusive; inasmuch as in England, where the restrictive system has been materially modified, distress has been as prevalent as in France. But although the circumstance here stated were true,—and it is much exaggerated,—the inference would not follow, except on the principle of *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*. The causes of the distress which some branches of industry in this country have experienced, since the blowing up of the paper system, towards the close of 1825, are not, we think, very difficult to discover; but whatever they may be, we take leave totally to deny, that there is even the shadow of an argument to induce any one to believe that the relaxations that have been introduced into our commercial policy are to be reckoned amongst them; and we are prepared to show, that but for these relaxations, the distress would have been much greater. Even Mr Sadler does not pretend that the French send us cottons, hardware, or broad cloths; neither does he, so far at least as we know, allege that they send us silks and gloves *gratis*. Hence it is plain, that if we now import a larger quantity of the latter articles than we did before the alteration of the law in 1825, we must export a greater quantity of the former to pay them. Whatever, therefore, may be the fact as to the silk and glove manufacture, the distress that has prevailed in the cotton and woollen trades, cannot possibly be owing to a greater importation of foreign goods; seeing that this very importation must have caused a proportionally great exportation of the articles we can produce cheaper. The truth is, that the distress, of which we have heard so much, has been chiefly confined to the weaving department; and has originated, not in any falling off in the demand for manufactured goods, but in the substitution of Power or Engine, for Hand looms. But distress springing from such a source cannot be permanent. It is already, indeed, fast disappearing; and will leave behind it the foundations of a new career of prosperity.

Even as respects the silk manufacture, it is certain, that instead of being injured, it has been largely benefited, by that very

alteration of the law, about which so much unfounded clamour has been raised. If, indeed, we attended only to the Speeches and Pamphlets of certain honourable gentlemen, we should at once conclude, that down to 1825, the silk trade had always been in a flourishing condition, and that those engaged in it had never experienced the smallest distress till it had been tampered with by ‘theorists.’ Supposing those who make these representations to be sincere, we must say that their acquaintance with the history of manufacturing industry is quite in keeping with their knowledge of principle. The fact is, that the silk trade has always been exposed to overwhelming vicissitudes; and that even in 1816, when Mr Vansittart took charge of our Finances, and Mr George Rose of our Trade,—when, in short, the restrictive system was maintained in its utmost purity,—the distress in the silk trade was ten times more severe than it has ever been since 1825. A meeting for the relief of the Spitalfields weavers was held at the Mansion-House, on the 26th of November, 1816, when the Secretary stated, that *two-thirds* of them were without employment, and without the means of support; ‘that some had ‘deserted their houses in despair, unable to endure the sight of ‘their starving families; and many pined under languishing diseases, brought on by the want of food and clothing.’ And Mr Fowell Buxton, M. P., stated at the same meeting, that the distress among the silk manufacturers was so intense, that ‘it partook of the nature of a pestilence, which spreads its contagion ‘around, and devastates an entire district.’ Such *was* the state of the silk trade under the *protective* system; but such, fortunately, is not its state now. In point of fact, the trade has been more improved and extended during the last three years than it was during the previous fifty; and in proof of the extraordinary advance that has been made, we beg to call the attention of our readers to the following official account of the quantities of raw and thrown silk imported from the year 1821 to 1828, inclusive—

Raw and Thrown Silk Imported.		Raw and Thrown Silk Imported.	
1821,	2,208,150 lbs.	1825,	3,578,198 lbs.
1822,	2,379,697	1826,	2,181,363
1823,	2,118,011	1827,	4,088,703
1824,	3,767,043,	1828,	4,458,446

Now, it appears from this table, that the depression of the manufacture in 1826—a depression not peculiar to it, and not therefore caused by the changes made in the previous year, but by the explosion that then took place in the paper system, has entirely disappeared; and that the quantities of raw and thrown



silk imported in 1827 and 1828 very greatly exceed the quantities imported in any previous period of equal duration. Instead of having declined like that of France, *the silk manufacture of England is at this moment twice as extensive as in 1821, 1822, and 1823.* The outrages that recently took place in Spitalfields, were not a consequence of low wages, and have now wholly subsided ; and we speak advisedly, and from the best information, when we say, that the trade is at this moment (October 1829) in a very satisfactory state ; that there is an extensive, steady, and increasing demand for the raw material, and the manufactured goods ; that the workmen, both at Spitalfields and Manchester, are fully employed ; and that those who are not employed at Coventry are so only in consequence of the application of power-looms to the weaving of ribbands. It is also an advantageous circumstance that few, comparatively, of those engaged in the silk manufacture are trading on borrowed capital. Little, therefore, can be apprehended from bankruptcy ; and we confidently anticipate the continued and rapid improvement of the manufacture.

The glove trade, which was said to be entirely sacrificed to the foreigner, is now also, for the first time, beginning to find itself in a healthy, sound, and really prosperous state. The importation of gloves from France is rapidly declining ; and we are well convinced, that the period is not far distant when the French will be exerting themselves to exclude the gloves of England. The following statement will show that we are not over sanguine :

Import of foreign manufactured gloves into London, for the six months, ending 1st September, 1828, . . .	Doz.	60,895
Do. for the six months, ending 1st Sep- tember, 1829, . . . . .		38,567
Decrease, . . . . .	Doz.	<u>22,328</u>

A very great increase has also taken place in the imports of skins for the manufacture of gloves.

Having thus briefly adverted to the state of the British silk and glove trades, we cannot forbear expressing the sense we entertain of Mr Fitzgerald's enlightened and manly conduct on the discussion of the silk question last session. Had he suffered himself to be influenced by the groundless clamour raised against

the new measures, and hesitated about carrying them into effect, the consequences would have been most pernicious. But he has shown, that while he has sagacity to perceive what is really for the public interest, he has courage to despise the misrepresentations and calumnies of those whose idol he might become, were he to sacrifice principle to prejudice.

Let it not, therefore, be said, that the experience of England is inconsistent with that of France. We, no doubt, have been involved in serious difficulties ; but so far from being caused, it is certain that they have been very materially mitigated, by the advances we have made towards a more liberal and enlightened commercial system. In France, however, the case is far otherwise. She has not suffered from the abuse of credit, and the explosion of an artificial paper system, resting on the most worthless foundations ; her commerce and industry have been ruined by efforts to foster them ; they have been so swathed and bandaged, so fenced about and protected, that their natural power and vigour have been paralysed, and they are in consequence quite unable to withstand the competition of those who are placed in a state of comparative freedom.

---

ART. IV.—*Memoirs of Lady Fanshawe, Wife of the Right Honourable Sir Richard Fanshawe, Baronet, Ambassador from Charles the Second to the Court of Madrid in 1665.* Written by Herself. To which are added, *Extracts from the Correspondence of Sir Richard Fanshawe.* 8vo. Pp. 360. Lond. 1829.

THERE is not much in this book, either of individual character, or public story. It is, indeed, but a small affair—any way ; but yet pleasing, and not altogether without interest or instruction. Though it presents us with no traits of historical importance, and but few of personal passion or adventure, it still gives us a peep at a scene of surpassing interest from a new quarter ; and at all events adds one other item to the great and growing store of those contemporary notices which are every day familiarizing us more and more with the living character of by-gone ages ; and without which we begin, at last, to be sensible, that we can neither enter into their spirit, nor even understand their public transactions. Writings not meant for publication, nor prepared for purposes of vanity or contention, are the only memorials in which the true ‘form and pressure’ of the ages which produce them are ever completely preserved ; and, indeed, the only documents from which the great events which are blazoned on their records can ever be satisfactorily explained. It is

in such writings alone,—confidential letters—private diaries—family anecdotes—and personal remonstrances, apologies, or explanations,—that the true springs of action are disclosed—as well as the obstructions and impediments, whether in the scruples of individuals or the general temper of society, by which their operation is so capriciously, and, but for these revelations, so unaccountably controlled. They are the true key to the cipher in which public annals are almost necessarily written; and their disclosure, after long intervals of time, is almost as good as the revocation of their writers from the dead—to abide our interrogatories, and to act over again, before us, in the very dress and accents of the time, a portion of the scenes which they once guided or adorned. It is not a very striking portion, perhaps, that is thus recalled by the publication before us; but whatever interest it possesses is mainly of this character. It belongs to an era, to which, of all others in our history, curiosity will always be most eagerly directed; and it constantly rivets our attention, by exciting expectations which it ought, in truth, to have fulfilled; and suggesting how much more interesting and instructive it might so easily have been made.

Lady Fanshawe was, as is generally known, the wife of a distinguished cavalier, in the Heroic Age of the civil wars and the Protectorate; and survived till long after the restoration. Her husband was a person of no mean figure in those great transactions; and she, who adhered to him with the most devoted attachment, and participated not unworthily in all his fortunes and designs, was, consequently, in continual contact with the movements which then agitated society, and had her full share of the troubles and triumphs which belonged to such an existence. Her *Memoirs ought*, therefore, to have formed an interesting counterpart to those of Mrs Hutchison; and to have recalled to us, with equal force and vivacity, the aspect under which those great events presented themselves to a female spectator and sufferer, of the opposite faction. But, though the title of the book, and the announcements of the editor, hold out this promise, we must say that the body of it falls far short of performance: and, whether it be that her side of the question did not admit of the same force of delineation or loftiness of sentiment; or, that the individual chronicler has been less fortunately selected, it is certain that, in point both of interest and instruction; in traits of character, warmth of colouring, or exaltation of feeling, there is no sort of comparison between these gossiping, and, though affectionate, yet relatively cold and feeble, memoranda, and the earnest, eloquent, and graphic representations of the puritan heroine. Nor should it be forgotten, even

in hinting at such a parallel, that, in one important respect, the royalist cause must be allowed to have been singularly happy in its female representative. Since, if it may be said with some show of reason, that Lucy Hutchison and her husband had too many elegant tastes and accomplishments to be taken as fair specimens of the austere and godly republicans; it certainly may be retorted, with at least equal justice, that the chaste and decorous Lady Fanshawe, and her sober diplomatic lord, shadow out rather too favourably the general manners and morals of the cavaliers.

After all, perhaps, the true secret of her inferiority, in all at least that relates to political interest, may be found in the fact, that the fair writer, though born and bred a royalist, and faithfully adhering to her husband in his efforts and sufferings in the cause, was not naturally, or of herself, particularly studious of such matters, or disposed to occupy herself more than was necessary with any public concern. She seems to have followed, like a good wife and daughter, where her parents or her husband led her; and to have adopted their opinions with a dutiful and implicit confidence, but without being very deeply moved by the principles or passions which actuated those from whom they were derived; while Lucy Hutchison not only threw her whole heart and soul into the cause of her party, but, like Lady Macbeth or Madame Roland, imparted her own fire to her more phlegmatic helpmate,—‘chastised him,’ when necessary, ‘with the valour of her tongue,’ and cheered him on, by the encouragement of her high example, to all the ventures and sacrifices, the triumphs or the martyrdoms, that lay visibly in her daring and lofty course. The Lady Fanshawe, we take it, was of a less passionate temperament; and her book, accordingly, is more like that of an ordinary woman, though living in extraordinary times. She begins, no doubt, with a good deal of love and domestic devotion, and even echoes, from that sanctuary, certain notes of loyalty; but, in very truth, is chiefly occupied, for the best part of her life, with the sage and serious business of some nineteen or twenty *accouchemens*, which are happily accomplished in different parts of Europe; and, at last, is wholly engrossed in the ceremonial of diplomatic presentations,—the description of court dresses, state coaches, liveries, and jewellery,—the solemnity of processions, and receptions by sovereign princes,—and the due interchange of presents and compliments with persons of worship and dignity. Fully one-third of her book is taken up with such goodly matter; and nearly as much with the genealogy of her kindred, and a faithful record of their marriages, deaths, and burials. From the remainder, however, some curious things may be gathered; and

we shall try to extract what strikes us as most characteristic. We may begin with something that preceded her own recollection. The following singular legend relates to her mother; and is given, it will be observed, on very venerable authority:

‘Dr Howlsworth preached her funeral sermon, in which, upon his own knowledge, he told, before many hundreds of people, this accident following: That my mother, being sick to death of a fever three months after I was born, which was the occasion she gave me suck no longer, her friends and servants thought, to all outward appearance, that she was dead, and so lay almost two days and a night; but Dr Winston coming to comfort my father, went into my mother’s room, and looking earnestly on her face, said she was so handsome, and now looks so lovely, I cannot think she is dead; and suddenly took a lancet out of his pocket, and with it cut the sole of her foot, which bled. Upon this, he immediately caused her to be laid upon the bed again, and to be rubbed, and such means, as she came to life, and opening her eyes, saw two of her kinswomen stand by her, my Lady Knollys and my Lady Russell, both with great wide sleeves, as the fashion then was, and said, Did not you promise me fifteen years, and are you come again? which they not understanding, persuaded her to keep her spirits quiet in that great weakness wherein she then was; but some hours after, she desired my father and Dr Howlsworth might be left alone with her, to whom she said, I will acquaint you, that, during the time of my trance, I was in great quiet, but in a place I could neither distinguish nor describe; but the sense of leaving my girl, who is dearer to me than all my children, remained a trouble upon my spirits. Suddenly I saw two by me, clothed in long white garments, and me thought I fell down with my face in the dust; and they asked me why I was troubled in so great happiness. I replied, O let me have the same grant given to Hezekiah, that I may live fifteen years, to see my daughter a woman: to which they answered, It is done; and then, at that instant, I awoke out of my trance; and Dr Howlsworth did there affirm, that that day she died made just fifteen years from that time.’—Pp. 26—28.

This gift of dreaming dreams, or seeing visions, seems, indeed, to have been hereditary in the family; for the following is given on the credit of the fair writer’s own experience. When she and her husband went to Ireland, on their way to Portugal, they were honourably entertained by all the distinguished royalists who came in their way. Among others, she has recorded that,

‘We went to the Lady Honor O’Brien’s, a lady that went for a maid, but few believed it! She was the youngest daughter of the Earl of Thomond. There we staid three nights. The first of which I was surprised by being laid in a chamber, where, about one o’clock, I heard a voice that wakened me. I drew the curtain, and, in the casement of the window, I saw, by the light of the moon, a woman leaning into the window, through the casement, in white, with red hair, and pale and ghastly complexion. She spoke loud, and in a tone I had never heard, thrice, “A horse!” and then, with a sigh more like the wind than breath, she vanished, and, to me, her body looked more like a thick cloud than sub-

stance. I was so much frightened, that my hair stood on end, and my night-clothes fell off. I pulled and pinched your father, who never woke during the disorder I was in ; but at last was much surprised to see me in this fright, and more so when I related the story and showed him the window opened. Neither of us slept any more that night, but he entertained me with telling me how much more these apparitions were usual in this country than in England ; and we concluded the cause to be the great superstition of the Irish, and the want of that knowing faith, which should defend them from the power of the devil, which he exercises among them very much.'

Ingenious and orthodox as this solution of the mystery must be allowed to be, we confess we should have been inclined to prefer that of the fair sleeper having had a fit of nightmare, had it not been for the conclusive testimony of the putative virgin of the house of Thomond, who supplies the following astonishing confirmation ; and leads us rather to suspect that the whole might have been a trick, to rid herself the sooner of their scrupulous and decorous company.

'About five o'clock,' continues Lady Fanshawe, 'the lady of the house came to see us, saying she had not been in bed all night, because a cousin O'Brien of hers, whose ancestors had owned that house, had desired her to stay with him in his chamber, and that he died at two o'clock, and she said, "I wish you to have had no disturbance, for 'tis the custom of the place, that, when any of the family are dying, the shape of a woman appears in the window every night till they be dead. This woman was many ages ago got with child by the owner of this place, who murdered her in his garden, and flung her into the river under the window, but truly I thought not of it when I lodged you here, it being the best room in the house." We made little reply to her speech, but disposed ourselves to be gone suddenly.'

We shall close this chapter, of the supernatural, with the following rather remarkable ghost story, which is calculated, we think, to make a strong impression on the imagination. Our diligent chronicler picked it up, it seems, on her way through Canterbury in the year 1663 ; and it is thus honourably attested :

'And here I cannot omit relating the ensuing story, confirmed by Sir Thomas Batten, Sir Arnold Breames, the Dean of Canterbury, with many more gentlemen and persons of this town.

'There lives not far from Canterbury a gentleman, called Colonel Colepeper, whose mother was widow unto the Lord Strangford : this gentleman had a sister, who lived with him, as the world said, in too much love. She married Mr Porter. This brother and sister being both atheists, and living a life according to their profession, went in a frolick into a vault of their ancestors, where, before they returned, they pulled some of their father's and mother's hairs. Within a very few days after, Mrs Porter fell sick and died. Her brother kept her body in a coffin set up in his buttery, saying it would not be long before he died, and then they would be both

buried together ; but from the night after her death, until the time that we were told the story, which was three months, they say that a head, as cold as death, with curled hair like his sister's, did ever lie by him wherever he slept, notwithstanding he removed to several places and countries to avoid it ; and several persons told us they had felt this apparition.'

We may now go back a little to the affairs of this world. Deep and devoted attachments are more frequently conceived in circumstances of distress and danger than in any other : and, accordingly, the love and marriage of Sir Richard Fanshawe and his lady befell during their anxious and perilous residence with the court at Oxford, in 1644. The following little sketch of the life they passed there is curious and interesting :

' My father commanded my sister and myself to come to him to Oxford, where the Court then was, but we, that had till that hour lived in great plenty and great order, found ourselves like fishes out of the water, and the scene so changed, that we knew not at all how to act any part but obedience ; for, from as good a house as any gentleman of England had, we came to a baker's house in an obscure street, and from rooms well furnished, to lie in a very bad bed in a garret, to one dish of meat, and that not the best ordered, no money, for we were as poor as Job, nor clothes more than a man or two brought in their cloak bags : we had the perpetual discourse of losing and gaining towns and men ; at the windows the sad spectacle of war, sometimes plagues, sometimes sicknesses of other kind, by reason of so many people being packed together, as, I believe, there never was before of that quality ; always in want, yet I must needs say, that most bore it with a martyr-like cheerfulness. For my own part, I began to think we should all, like Abraham, live in tents all the days of our lives. The King sent my father a warrant for a baronet, but he returned it with thanks, saying he had too much honour of his knighthood which his Majesty had honoured him with some years before, for the fortune he now possessed.'—Pp. 35—37.

They were married very privately the year after ; and certainly entered upon life with little but their mutual love to cheer and support them ; but it seems to have been sufficient.

' Both his fortune and my promised portion, which was made L.10,000, were both at that time in expectation ; and we might truly be called merchant adventurers, for the stock we set up our trading with did not amount to twenty pounds betwixt us ; but, however, it was to us as a little piece of armour is against a bullet, which, if it be right placed, though no bigger than a shilling, serves as well as a whole suit of armour ; so our stock bought pen, ink, and paper, which was your father's trade, and by it, I assure you, we lived better than those who were born to L.2000 a-year, as long as he had his liberty.'—Pp. 37, 38.

The next scene presents both of them in so amiable and respectable a light, that we think it but justice to extract it, though rather long, without any abridgement. It is, indeed, one of the most pleasing and interesting passages in the book. They had now gone to Bristol, in 1645.

‘ My husband had provided very good lodgings for us, and as soon as he could come home from the Council, where he was at my arrival, he with all expressions of joy received me in his arms, and gave me a hundred pieces of gold, saying, “ I know thou that keeps my heart so well, will keep my fortune, which from this time I will ever put into thy hands as God shall bless me with increase ;” and now I thought myself a perfect queen, and my husband so glorious a crown, that I more valued myself to be called by his name than born a princess ; for I knew him very wise and very good, and his soul doated on me,—upon which confidence I will tell you what happened. My Lady Rivers, a brave woman, and one that had suffered many thousand pounds loss for the King, and whom I had a great reverence for, and she a kindness for me as a kinswoman, in discourse she tacitly commended the knowledge of state affairs, and that some women were very happy in a good understanding thereof, as my Lady Aubigny, Lady Isabel Thynne, and divers others, and yet none was at first more capable than I ; that in the night she knew there came a post from Paris from the Queen, and that she would be extremely glad to hear what the Queen commanded the King in order to his affairs ; saying, if I would ask my husband privately, he would tell me what he found in the packet, and I might tell her. I, that was young and innocent, and to that day had never in my mouth “ What news ?” began to think there was more in enquiring into public affairs than I thought of, and that it being a fashionable thing would make me more beloved of my husband, if that had been possible, than I was. When my husband returned home from Council, after welcoming him, as his custom ever was he went with his handful of papers into his study for an hour or more ; I followed him ; he turned hastily, and said, “ What wouldst thou have, my life ?” I told him, I heard the Prince had received a packet from the Queen, and I guessed it was that in his hand, and I desired to know what was in it ; he smilingly replied, “ My love, I will immediately come to thee ; pray thee go, for I am very busy :” when he came out of his closet I revived my suit ; he kissed me, and talked of other things. At supper I would eat nothing ; he as usual sat by me, and drank often to me, which was his custom, and was full of discourse to company that was at table. Going to bed I asked again, and said I could not believe he loved me if he refused to tell me all he knew ; but he answered nothing, but stopped my mouth with kisses. So we went to bed ; I cried, and he went to sleep ! Next morning early, as his custom was, he called to rise, but began to discourse with me first, to which I made no reply ; he rose, came on the other side of the bed and kissed me, and drew the curtains softly and went to Court. When he came home to dinner, he presently came to me as was usual, and when I had him by the hand, I said, “ Thou dost not care to see me troubled ;” to which he, taking me in his arms, answered, “ My dearest soul, nothing upon earth can afflict me like that, and when you asked me of my business, it was wholly out of my power to satisfy thee, for my life and fortune shall be thine, and every thought of my heart in which the trust I am in may not be revealed ; but my honour is my own, which I cannot preserve if I communicate the Prince’s affairs ; and, pray thee, with this answer rest satisfied.” So great was his reason and goodness, that, upon consideration, it made my folly appear to me so



vile, that from that day until the day of his death, I never thought fit to ask him any business, but what he communicated freely to me in order to his estate or family.'

After the ill success of the royal arms had made it necessary for the Prince to retire beyond seas, Lady Fanshawe and her husband attended him to the Scilly Islands. We give this natural and simple picture of their discomforts on that expedition :

'The next day, after having been pillaged, and extremely sick and big with child, I was set on shore, almost dead, in the island of Scilly ; when we had got to our quarters near the Castle, where the Prince lay, I went immediately to bed, which was so vile, that my footman ever lay in a better, and we had but three in the whole house, which consisted of four rooms, or rather partitions, two low rooms, and two little lofts, with a ladder to go up : in one of these they kept dried fish, which was his trade, and in this my husband's two clerks lay ; one there was for my sister, and one for myself, and one amongst the rest of the servants ; but when I waked in the morning, I was so cold I knew not what to do, but the daylight discovered that my bed was near swimming with the sea, which the owner told us afterwards it never did so—but at *spring-tide*.'

We must not omit her last interview with her unfortunate Sovereign, which took place at Hampton Court, when his star was hastening to its setting ! It is the only interview with that unhappy Prince of which she has left any notice, and is, undoubtedly, very touching and amiable.

'During his stay at Hampton Court, my husband was with him ; to whom he was pleased to talk much of his concerns, and gave him three credentials for Spain, with private instructions, and letters for his service ; but God, for our sins, disposed his Majesty's affairs otherwise. I went three times to pay my duty to him, both as I was the daughter of his servant, and wife of his servant. The last time I ever saw him, when I took my leave, I could not refrain weeping. When he had saluted me, I prayed to God to preserve his Majesty with long life and happy years ; he stroked me on the cheek, and said, " Child, if God pleaseth it shall be so ! both you and I must submit to God's will, and you know in what hands I am in ;" then turning to your father, he said, " Be sure, Dick, to tell my son all that I have said, and deliver those letters to my wife ; pray God bless her ! I hope I shall do well ;" and taking him in his arms, said, " Thou hast ever been an honest man, and I hope God will bless thee, and make thee a happy servant to my son, whom I have charged in my letter to continue his love, and trust to you ;" adding, " I do promise you, that if ever I am restored to my dignity, I will bountifully reward you for both your service and sufferings." Thus did we part from that glorious sun, that within a few months after was murdered, to the grief of all Christians that were not forsaken by God.'

These are almost sufficient specimens of the work before us ; for it would not be fair to extract the whole substance of it. However, we must add the following striking trait of heroism and devoted affection, especially as we have spoken rather too

disparagingly of the fair writer's endowment of those qualities. In point of courage and love to her husband it is quite on a level, perhaps, with any of the darings of Mrs Hutchison,—though we cannot say that the occasion called so clearly for their display. During their voyage to Portugal, and

‘ When we had just passed the Straits, we saw coming towards us, with full sails, a Turkish galley, well manned, and we believed we should be all carried away slaves, for this man had so laden his ship with goods for Spain, that his guns were useless, though the ship carried sixty guns. He called for brandy, and after he had well drunken, and all his men, which were near two hundred, he called for arms, and cleared the deck as well as he could, resolving to fight rather than lose his ship, which was worth thirty thousand pounds. This was sad for us passengers, but my husband bid us be sure to keep in the cabin, and not appear, the women, which would make the Turks think that we were a man-of-war, but if they saw women, they would take us for merchants, and board us. He went upon the deck, and took a gun and bandoliers, and sword, and, with the rest of the ship's company, stood upon deck expecting the arrival of the Turkish man-of-war. This beast, the captain, had locked me up in the cabin; I knocked and called long to no purpose, until at length the cabin-boy came and opened the door. I, all in tears, desired him to be so good as to give me his blue thrum cap he wore, and his tarred coat, which he did, and I gave him half-a-crown, and putting them on, and flinging away my night clothes, I crept up softly and stood upon the deck by my husband's side, as free from sickness and fear as, I confess, from discretion; but it was the effect of that passion which I could never master.

‘ By this time the two vessels were engaged in parley, and so well satisfied with speech and sight of each other's forces, that the Turks' man-of-war tacked about, and we continued our course. But when your father saw it convenient to retreat, looking upon me, he blessed himself, and snatched me up in his arms, saying, “ Good God, that love can make this change !” and though he seemingly chid me, he would laugh at it as often as he remembered that voyage.’

What follows is almost as strong a proof of that ‘ love which ‘ casteth out fear;’ while it is more unexceptionable on the score of prudence. Sir Richard being in arms for the King at the fatal battle of Worcester, was afterwards taken prisoner, and brought to London; to which place his faithful consort immediately repaired, where, in the midst of her anxieties,

‘ I met a messenger from him with a letter, which advised me of his condition, and told me he was very civilly used, and said little more, but that I should be in some room at Charing-cross, where he had promise from his keeper that he should rest there in my company at dinner-time; this was meant to him as a great favour. I expected him with impatience, and on the day appointed provided a dinner and room, as ordered, in which I was with my father and some more of our friends, where, about eleven of the clock, we saw hundreds of poor soldiers, both English and Scotch, march all naked on foot, and many with your father, who was very

cheerful in appearance; who, after he had spoken and saluted me and his friends there, said, "Pray let us not lose time, for I know not how little I have to spare; this is the chance of war; nothing venture, nothing have; so let us sit down and be merry whilst we may;" then taking my hand in his, and kissing me, "Cease weeping, no other thing upon earth can move me; remember we are all at God's disposal."

'During the time of his imprisonment, I failed not constantly to go, when the clock struck four in the morning, with a dark lantern in my hand all alone and on foot, from my lodging in Chancery Lane, at my cousing Young's, to Whitehall, in at the entry that went out of King Street into the bowling-green. There I would go under his window and softly call him; he, after the first time excepted, never failed to put out his head at the first call; thus we talked together, and sometimes I was so wet with the rain, that it went in at my neck and out at my heels. He directed how I should make my addresses, which I did ever to their general, Cromwell, who had a great respect for your father, and would have bought him off to his service upon any terms.

'Being one day to solicit for my husband's liberty for a time, he bid me bring, the next day, a certificate from a physician, that he was really ill. Immediately I went to Dr Batters, that was by chance both physician to Cromwell and to our family, who gave me one very favourable in my husband's behalf. I delivered it at the Council Chamber, at three of the clock that afternoon, as he commanded me, and he himself moved, that seeing they could make no use of his imprisonment, whereby to lighten them in their business, that he might have his liberty upon L.4000 bail, to take a course of physick, he being dangerously ill. Many spake against it, but most Sir Henry Vane, who said he would be as instrumental, for aught he knew, to hang them all that sat there, if ever he had opportunity; but if he had liberty for a time, that he might take the engagement before he went out; upon which Cromwell said, "I never knew that the engagement was a medicine for the scorbutic." They, hearing their general say so, thought it obliged him, and so ordered him his liberty upon bail.'

These are specimens of what we think best in the work; but, as there may be readers who would take an interest in her description of court ceremonies, or, at least, like to see how she manages them, we shall conclude with a little fragment of such a description.

'This afternoon I went to pay my visit to the Duchess of Albuquerque. When I came to take coach, the soldiers stood to their arms, and the Lieutenant that held the colours displaying them, which is never done to any one but to kings, or such as represent their persons, I stood still all the while, then at the lowering of the colours to the ground, they received for them a low courtesy from me, and for himself a bow; then taking coach with very many persons, both in coaches and on foot, I went to the Duke's palace, where I was again received by a guard of his Excellency's, with the same ceremony of the King's colours as before. Then I was received by the Duke's brother and near a hundred persons of quality. I laid my hand upon the wrist of his Excellency's right hand; he putting his cloak thereupon, as the Spanish fashion is, went up the stairs, upon the top of

which stood the Duchess and her daughter, who received me with great civility, putting me into every door, and all my children, till we came to sit down in her Excellency's chamber, where she placed me on her right hand, upon cushions, as the fashion of this court is, being very rich, and laid upon Persia carpets.'

'The two dukes embraced my husband with great kindness, welcoming him to the place, and the Duke of Medina Celi led me to my coach, an honour that he had never done any but once, when he waited on your Queen to help her on the like occasion. The Duke d'Alcala led my eldest daughter, and the younger led my second, and the Governor of Cadiz, Don Antonio de Pimentel, led the third. Mrs Kestian carried Betty in her arms.'

There is great choice of this sort for those who like it; and not a little of the more solemn and still duller discussion of diplomatic etiquette and precedence. But, independent of these, and of the genealogies and obituaries, which are not altogether without interest, there is enough both of heart, and sense, and observation in these Memoirs, at once to repay gentle and intelligent readers for the trouble of perusing them, and to stamp a character of amiableness and respectability on the memory of their author.

ART. V. *Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ Byzantinæ*. Editio emendatior et copiosior, consilio B. G. Niebuhrii instituta.

Pars 3. *Agathiæ Myrin. Historiarum libri 5, cum vers. Lat. et annot.* B. Vulcanii; B. G. Niebubrius Gr. recensuit. 8vo. Bonnæ, 1828.

Pars 11. *Leonis Diaconi Caloënsis Historiæ libri 10, et liber de relitatione bellica Nicephori Augusti.* E. rec. C. B. Hasi. *Addita ejusdem versione atque annot. ab ipso recognitis.* 8vo. Bonnæ, 1827, pp. 624.

Pars 19. *Nicephori Gregoriæ Byzantina Historia, Gr. et Lat. cum annot.* H. Wolfii, C. Ducangii, T. Boivini, et Cl. Caperonnerii. Cur. L. Schopeni; vol. i. 8vo. Bonnæ, 1829, pp. 568.

Pars 20. *Cantacuzeni, Joh. ex imperat. Historiarum libri 4. Gr. et Lat.* Cur. Lud. Schopeni; vol. i. 8vo. Bonnæ, 1828, pp. 560.

Pars . *Constantini Porphyrogeniti Imperat. de Ceremoniis Aulæ Byzantinæ libri duo. Gr. et Lat.* E. rec. J. J. Reiskii, *cum ejusdem Comment. integris*; vol. i. 8vo. Bonnæ, 1829, pp. 807. Weber, Bonnæ; Treuttel, Würtz, et soc. Londini.

**T**HE Latin language, which was preserved chiefly by the Church of Rome, prevented the people of the West from falling in-

to a savage state. When the Greek was introduced into Italy, it elevated the Italians, and afterwards the other Western nations, and restored to the world a part of the civility of ancient times. There are thus two portions of history, which are peculiarly interesting to the scholar and the friend of his species; the one is, the history of the Papal power, the other, that of the Byzantine empire. The former is the history of the lower school, the latter, that of the higher end; and these two histories connect the origin of human science in the ancient world, with its partial revival in modern times. The history of the Eastern empire is the mysterious chain which unites the present with antiquity; we wish, therefore, that it were told in our native language, with as much detail as would render it instructive and intelligible, yet with so much brevity as would secure it against tediousness. The history of Great Britain has little, if any, connexion with that of Constantinople; Russia, Austria, and France, have various points of union, and are not without historical sympathies; the Austrian and French literati, especially the latter, have accordingly done good service in preserving and illustrating the monuments of the transactions of the East. Our own countrymen have contributed little to this department of letters. The dispute, or schism, between the Eastern and Western churches, has caused the inhabitants of the West to feel less interest and sympathy in the misfortunes of the Eastern empire; and the defection from the ancient Catholic faith, as some obstinately persist in calling the Reformation, has again divided Christendom against itself. It cannot be denied, that in Great Britain we are strangely prone to indulge a sectarian spirit, and to believe that it is easy to be curious about the fortunes of a Protestant, difficult to esteem a Papist, and impossible to enter into the feelings of a Greek Christian. Success, besides, is inspiring, and we are somewhat unwilling to enquire into the annals of declining states, to consult the historians of a decaying empire: ‘*Nobiles autem ingeniorum unà cum imperio deficientium reliquias, quasi optimi viri poseam, si frugis sumus, non usque quaque fastidiamus.*’

Byzantine history comprehends a prodigious collection of curious facts, and innumerable illustrations of manners, customs, and usages. Much valuable information respecting the commerce and statistics of the middle ages, may be gleaned from its pages. It is eminently rich, moreover, in explanations of Roman institutions; for the emperor of the East, although he resided in the imperial colony of Constantinople, always esteemed himself the legitimate monarch of the Romans; his money has commonly a Latin legend. Indeed, an enumeration of the Ro-

man usages that were retained, even until the last destruction of his empire, would be needless. Since we have mentioned the Byzantine money, we cannot forbear to observe a very remarkable instance of long-continued tradition: we have seen on several coins of the Greek emperors, of considerable antiquity, the head of the Saviour, with precisely the same cast of countenance that we commonly find in the works of the older Italian masters.

With respect to style, the Byzantines of the middle ages are frequently deficient; they are fond of the vain accumulation of synonymes, and, by their tautology, often remind us of the writings of English lawyers; they are, however, less guilty of this vice. They are frequently verbose and rhetorical, and too prone to make an ostentatious display of their acquirements in those sciences which are the mistresses of language—grammar, logic, and rhetoric. They forget that Homer and Sophocles, Demosthenes and Plato, were as good grammarians at least as any writers who succeeded them, but they had so many other excellencies, that their masterly skill in grammar is for the most part unnoticed. Demosthenes, we well know, was quite as good a logician as St Thomas Aquinas: we do not deny the merit of the saint in dialectics, but the former endeavoured to conceal his art, and the latter sought to display it ostentatiously on all occasions. The Greeks, however, were less addicted to the Aristotelian logic than the Latins; and, even in the worst times, were less obtrusive dialecticians. Cantacuzene derides the affectation of logical method, and says, ironically, ‘If this is not enough, we will give you the authority of Aquinas, the Latin doctor, who breathes syllogisms, rather than air: τὰ παρὰ Λατίνους διδασκάλου Θωμᾶ, συλλογισμὸν μᾶλλον ἢ ἀέρα πνέοντος.’

If we commence with Constantine and the foundation of the city, A. D. 330, the Byzantine history will embrace a period of more than eleven centuries, to the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, A. D. 1453, on the 29th May,—a day remarkable in our own annals. Martin Hankins, in his learned and valuable treatise, *De Byzantinorum Rerum Scriptoribus Græcis*, takes the entire period; and he has given us the lives of fifty authors who wrote in the Greek language, and a critical account of their writings. He includes in his list, however, ecclesiastical authors as well as civil, and many, of whom only trifling fragments remain. If we commence with the reign of Justinian—and we have before his time only the Life of Constantine, by Eusebius, and some fragments—the period will comprehend nine centuries.

Some works have been discovered since the time of Hankins,

with which he was unacquainted. The entire mass of history is very considerable; it would be too much, therefore, to require the scholar to read at length the prolix and languid story; there are many portions, however, replete with interest. Several of their writers abound in facts; and as this kind of writing attracts the generality of readers, some of their works might perhaps be advantageously translated into the vernacular languages of Europe. When we say that the Byzantine history has received little attention from our own countrymen, we would make one distinguished exception. Although this great writer was born in England, and composed his immortal work in the English language, we may consider him, in literary habits, rather as a foreigner than an Englishman. We, of course, refer to the author of *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, who, if he treats of Byzantine affairs somewhat briefly, convinces all who are capable of judging, that he had carefully investigated, and deeply studied, the subject.

The earliest editions of these historians were, for the most part, by learned Germans: the Latin translation not uncommonly appeared before the original Greek. The series was published by the French king in thirty-six volumes, in folio, commencing A. D. 1648. Some of the notes, especially those by the great Byzantine antiquary, Du Cange, are of considerable merit. The style of execution is unusually splendid; but the size of the volumes renders them cumbrous and inconvenient. This series was reprinted at Venice, in 1729, with some additions, in a less expensive form; but this edition is very incorrect. There have been a few separate editions of some of these authors, at different times, but a few only; and although we are not exactly warranted in classing them with rare books, it cannot be denied that for the most part they are scarce, and that the studious greatly need such an edition as the present. We cannot allow ourselves to speak of the text farther, than to state generally, that considerable care has been bestowed upon it, and in some instances, many various readings have been collected. A Latin interpretation is subjoined—we had rather it were printed separately, for the sake of persons who are unable to consult the historians in the original; or at least that it were relegated, with the emendations and corrections, to the end of the volume, for they spoil the otherwise handsome appearance of the page. Niebuhr judiciously declares, in his preface, that he would have preferred to have omitted the interpretation altogether; not so the French editor of Cantacuzene. He says, the Emperor would be quite delighted if he knew that his work was printed with a Latin

translation. ‘Quin imo, si quid manes sentiunt, id ipsi Cantauzeno acceptissimum fore credibile est, quod Latinæ linguæ et Græcæ quodam consortio quasi quodammodo inter veterem novamque Romam bene convenire videatur, quod ille vivus percupierat.’ If the *consortium* give pleasure to the shades of these good people, we must acquiesce in it. Geography and Chronology, it is said, are the handmaids of History. It is pleasant, in this edition, to find the latter always at her post, standing dutifully behind the chair of her mistress; for the meritorious editors have carefully marked the date in the margin, and often in a fourfold form,—the year of the world, according to the Greek computation, of the vulgar era, of the reigning emperor, and of the indiction. That we may do justice to the useful and honourable labours of the learned editors, we will speak shortly of each of the parts that are already published.

The first that appeared contains the history of Agathias. This writer bears the title of *σχολαστικός*, which, in his time, signified a lawyer, as James Gothofredus, in his precious commentary on the Theodosian code, tells us. He gives this simple account of himself in his preface: ‘My name is Agathias; Myrina, in Asia, is my native place; my father’s name Memnonius; and my profession the Roman law and the contention of the courts.’

The description of his pursuits, with which he commences the third book, is curious, and to some, through sympathy, it will even be affecting. After relating that he eagerly desires to pass his life in writing history, and in the study of philosophy and the *belles lettres*, he adds, ‘but I sit in the Royal Portico, and ponder and turn over many volumes filled with law-suits and business, from the morning until sunset, and I am greatly tormented by people who give me trouble, yet I should, on the other hand, lament if they did not trouble me; for I should not be able to obtain a competent share of the necessities of life, without labour and sufferings.’ This historian is an additional example, that, in the ancient world, a large proportion of the best and most useful writers were lawyers: that profession furnished the most valuable of the fathers of the Latin church, and vast numbers of the most distinguished literary characters throughout Europe have in all times belonged to it. England has contributed several, but, we lament to say, fewer in proportion than other countries; because the laws of England have always been studied in an illiberal manner, and especially during the last century. We have lately witnessed a remarkable confirmation of this assertion. It was proposed, in order to raise the character of the profession, to require a slight examination from the candidates



for admission as students at the Inns of Court, and to the Bar, as a proof that they had received the first rudiments of a liberal education; this reasonable proposal was, however, violently opposed, and by persons of merit and ability. In the ancient world, the student of jurisprudence was invigorated by drinking largely of the noble fountains of philosophy, and by grammatical, logical, and rhetorical learning. A liberal profession was thus adorned and improved by being blended with liberal pursuits.

Agathias is one of the best of the Byzantines in point of style. He was a writer of pastorals, and we may observe in his composition the peculiarities of the erotic writers. His sentences are brief and pointed, with an affected plainness and perspicuity, which are not in the best taste, but which we like in spite of ourselves, and in opposition to our better judgment. He seems to have been an admirer of the mythological learning of Nonnus, for he cites the *Dionysiaca* in his 4th Book; and he composed many epigrams, of which more than one hundred are extant in the *Anthology*. Mr Gibbon, speaking of him, says, 'we must now relinquish a statesman and soldier, (Procopius,) to attend the footsteps of a poet and rhetorician.' Mr Gibbon in general makes a rational estimate of men and things, but he often displays a childish admiration for statesmen and soldiers; he cannot for a moment forget, that he once sat in parliament himself, and served a short time in the militia. It seems probable that Agathias was a Pagan; it is certain that he was very tolerant, and that his opinion respecting theology was not unphilosophical, for he says of a vain quack named Uranius, that he was not afraid, καὶ Θεολογίας ἐράπτεσθαι πράγματος ἔγω μακαρίη τε καὶ ἀνεφίκτης, καὶ μείζονος ἢ κατ' ἀνθρώπου, καὶ μόνῳ τῷ ἀγνοεῖσθαι θαυμαζόμενῃ.

The five books of the Wars of Justinian contain much curious matter, and we would willingly select as a specimen of the manner of Agathias, who, as Niebuhr says, is '*non omnino illepidus*,' his account, in the second book, of the expectations, reception, and disappointment of the philosophers who went to Chosroes. The story is well told, and it reminds us of the visit of the French *litterati* to Frederic of Prussia and the Empress Catharine; but we must pass on to the next part.

The editors first give us No. 3, they then skip to No. 11, and proceed next to No. 19; a mode of publication which is very inconvenient to the studious purchaser. The 2d, or 11th Part, contains the history of Leo Diaconus. This writer treats of a very short period, from A.D. 959, to A.D. 975,—only sixteen years. He presents us with some curious matter; as, for ex-

ample, the minute account of a comet that appeared in the beginning of the month of August, A. D. 975, and was visible for eighty days. Historians seldom afford such precise descriptions of these phenomena, and we would gladly, if we had room, transcribe it. Leo considers himself a better astrologer than the persons who had given a flattering explanation of the import of the celestial visitor. This portion of Constantinopolitan history was first published by C. B. Hase, at the expense of Count Nicholas de Romanzoff, at Paris, in 1819, in folio, and in a very handsome style. It includes also a treatise, *De Velitatione Bellica*, which was first published by Hase, and some other short pieces. Amongst them are six novels of Nicephorus Phocas; the most interesting of which is a long one, that may be called, to borrow a feudal phrase, a statute of mortmain, for it forbids building any more monasteries, or endowing them with land; and in a long preamble, the legislator reminds the monks, that St Paul supported himself by the labour of his own hands, and cites other similar authorities, which, it seems, were not much in favour with the Greek clergy. The German scholars originate many important works, but they are apt to overdo whatever they take in hand. A note beginning thus, ‘Idomeneus, rex Cretensis, qui maxime in ‘Trojano bello inclaruit. Hic cum post eversam Trojam,’ and so forth, p. 553, might well be spared. No one, surely, who takes up the Byzantine historians, need to be told who Idomeneus was. This annotation is not of Rhenish growth, it is true, but a judicious selection ought to have been made from the commentaries of others.

We are sorry to see the dialogue entitled *Philopatris*, which is usually printed with the works of Lucian, included in a collection of the Byzantine historians. The Prussian editor asserts, that it was written in the year 968-9. We have not leisure to discuss the question at present; but if the ingenious critic were able to demonstrate to his own satisfaction, that the *Lysistrata* of Aristophanes was not composed by that admirable poet, but by the Princess Anna Comnena, would he be justified in appending the comedy to the *Alexiad*, at least in a body of historians? For if he undertook to publish a complete edition of the works of that learned lady, it would of course be his duty to insert the most curious and valuable piece. Hase has given, in his edition of Leo, a list of the words in his author which have not yet found their way into Lexicons; a judicious course, and worthy of imitation.

The 3d, or 19th Part, contains a portion of the history of Nicephorus Gregoras. This writer was born about the year 1295. His voluminous history consists of thirty-eight books;

perhaps we may reduce the number to thirty-two, for it is said that the last six are dogmatical. Eleven books were published by Wolfius at Basle, A. D. 1562, and more correctly at Paris, in 1702, by Boivin, who added thirteen more books, and promised to give the remaining fourteen, which, strange to say, are still unpublished. They exist in MS. at Rome, and in part at least at Paris also. It is little to the credit of those who have the care of them, that they have not yet appeared. Gregoras wrote on various subjects; some of his other works are in existence in MS. The first eleven books published by Wolf, and which are contained in the 19th Part of the Bern edition, comprehend a period of 137 years, from A. D. 1204 to A. D. 1341. Gregoras had many friends, or flatterers, and as many enemies, and they were equally unsparing of praise and censure. He was a man of extensive and various erudition, and of a prodigiously rhetorical disposition. We cannot forbear to extract from his history, his apologue of the Cobbler's Cat. 'It happened at that time that the Patriarch of Alexandria, in Egypt, was on a visit at Constantinople; he was a venerable man, and he adorned his exemplary manners by the acuteness of his remarks, and on that account was treated with great reverence and good-will by the Emperor Andronicus. Having observed the zealous and glowing affection of the Emperor for Athanasius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and hearing him with surprise continually extolling the Patriarch, and striving with all his might to place him on a level with the great St Chrysostom, he very pleasantly reproved the unseasonable exaggerations and prepossessions of the Emperor, by such a discourse as this,—“There was once a man,” he said, “who was a cobbler by trade, and he had a cat that was in colour perfectly white, and she used to catch every day one of the mice that infested the house. It happened one day, that she fell by chance into the vessel in which the cobbler kept his blacking; she had great difficulty in getting out again, and was dyed quite black. When the mice saw her, they immediately supposed, that, having assumed the monastic habit, she had of course given up eating flesh; they began, therefore, to run about the floor without fear, and to hunt up and down for their food; but the cat coming up, and seeing such a noble prize, felt a great desire to catch them all at once; she was not able to do so, however, but seizing two, instantly devoured them. The rest of the mice ran away, wondering how it could be that she had become more cruel than ever, after putting on the monastic habit. I fear, therefore, that this Athanasius, having now got possession of

‘ the patriarchal throne, will outdo his former severity by his ‘ excessive harshness in future, and on account of the estimation which he will derive from thence.” ’—L. 7. It cannot be denied that the Byzantines are sometimes prolix, yet a certain space is required, in order to afford amusement and to create an interest, for an extreme brevity can produce merely a dry catalogue of names and dates.

The next part, which is numbered 20, contains the first volume of the History of the Ex-emperor, John Cantacuzene. He treats of part of the same period as Gregoras. This volume commences A. D. 1320, and ends A. D. 1341; the whole work extends to forty years. It is evident that public opinion had some power at Constantinople in the fourteenth century, since an Emperor has thought it worth his while to appeal to it, or to compose a voluminous life, or an apology for a life. The editors have selected a passage from *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, which they offer, not without a just tribute to the excellent learning and judgment of the author, as containing a fair estimate of the imperial composition. ‘ The name and situation of ‘ the Emperor, John Cantacuzene, might inspire the most lively ‘ curiosity. His memorials of forty years, extend from the revolt ‘ of the younger Andronicus, to his own abdication of the empire; ‘ and it is observed, that, like Moses and Cæsar, he was the principal actor in the scenes which he describes. But in this eloquent work, we should vainly seek the sincerity of a hero or a ‘ penitent. Retired in a cloister from the vices and passions of ‘ the world, he presents not a confession, but an apology, of the ‘ life of an ambitious statesman. Instead of unfolding the true ‘ counsels and characters of men, he displays the smooth and ‘ specious surface of events, highly varnished with his own ‘ praises and those of his friends. Their motives are always ‘ pure; their ends always legitimate: they conspire and rebel ‘ without any views of interest; and the violence which they inflict or suffer is celebrated as the spontaneous effect of reason ‘ and virtue.’ Yet Gibbon softens towards Cantacuzene, when he proceeds briefly to relate his history after him.

This Emperor was the author of a very curious work, published in folio at Basil, in the year 1512, in the original Greek, with a Latin translation by the learned Rodolph Walter of Zurich, entitled, *Joannis Cantacuzeni, Cptani regis, contra Mahometicam fidem Christiana et Orthodoxa Assertio*. A Persian nobleman had been converted to Christianity, and sought refuge at Constantinople, where he took the name of Meletius, and became a monk. One of his countrymen, at the instigation of the devil, as the Emperor affirms, undertook to bring back the

apostate, and addressed letters to him, which he desired to answer, but was unable from want of language; his friend and patron, Cantacuzene, lent his tongue to Meletius and to truth; the proselyte supplied information, tinged, however, with the unfavourable colouring of a proselyte, and the Emperor found language. This work is comprised in four Apologies, and four Discourses, and is not very long. It would be foreign to our present purpose, and greatly exceed our limits, to discourse further concerning it. Although there are many curious passages in this production of the imperial theologian, we will only extract one, relating to a much-controverted subject. ‘The apostles and disciples of Christ wrote and taught what they saw, and what they heard from the mouth of Christ himself. Four, therefore, of the disciples of Christ wrote a gospel. One of them, named Matthew, in *Hebrew*, and he published this for the use of Palestine, or Jerusalem, and part of Africa: another, Mark, in *Latin*, for Achaia, and it was published for Italy and Rome, and indeed all the western nations: another, Luke, in *Greek*, and it was for the use of Asia, and Æthiopia, and Persia, and India, and Arabia; and the other, John, in *Greek* also, and it was published for parts of Europe and the islands, and wherever Greeks are found. Thus the gospel was diffused throughout the whole world, not by violence and compulsion, nor with the sword and with arms, but we find, that the apostles taught the word of God in charity, gladness, and humility.’—Apol. 4. We have here the distinct opinion of an eminent theologian on a disputed point, and it perhaps includes also the tradition of the Greek church.

The last part, to which no number is affixed, contains the two books of the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, ‘*de Ceremoniis Aulae Byzantinæ*.’ Niebuhr speaks slightly of the subject of this work in his preface: ‘Scio ego,’ are his words, ‘libros Constantinianos de ceremoniis, quos inscriptio ipsa circa nugæ versari prodat, a plurimis contemni planè ac derideri; neque negabo majorem prioris libri partem ita esse comperatam ut ingenuo homini nauseam moveat.’ The ingenious student, it is true, is not likely to be incited to penetrate into the ceremonial of the Byzantine court, when he finds, on turning over the pages, a chapter which appears to treat of the proper manner of cutting the hair of the prince, and which is headed thus: ‘Observanda in tonsione filii imperatoris.’—L. 2, c. 23. The *κούρευμα*, however, was a religious rite; and it is not impossible that many of these performances, the description of which is tiresome to read, were agreeable enough to look at; especially to the lower classes, for whose diversion they were

chiefly designed. Ceremonies are delightful to children and the common people, and they are sometimes pleasing even to the wise, perhaps through a sympathy in the pleasures of others. This treatise was first published by the learned Reiske, in the year 1751, at Leipsic, from a MS. which seemed to have been written by the same hand, with the same pen, and on the same day: '*Elegantia Scripturæ tanta apparet, ac si integrum volu-  
'men non solum eâdem manu, sed eodem calamo eâdemque die,  
'descriptum esset.*' Though it is true that many ceremonies are of great and unknown antiquity—that Constantine explains the rites of the Greek Church and its liturgy in the tenth century—that he throws light upon several portions of history, and opens some new historical inquiries—we had rather that this thick volume had been postponed for some time. It would have served to conclude the Byzantine series, and would have gracefully closed the goodly procession.

This Constantine was born A. D. 905; but some attribute the work to another Constantine, who lived a century later, and are inclined to doubt, whether it be the production of Constantine, the son of Leo; chiefly because the author speaks of himself as being dead, and describes his own monument. The better opinion, however, seems to be, that these passages, (and they are few and unimportant), are additions and interpolations. An accurate description of the ceremonial of the court, from so high an authority, would, no doubt, be greatly esteemed at Constantinople, and we may easily believe that it was often copied, and that respect and gratitude towards the illustrious author, might suggest such insertions in passages which appeared to invite them. On this subject the curious may consult Reiske, a man in whom vivacity was nothing impaired by great learning. This quality is so apt to be overlaid and choked by erudition, that whenever a profound scholar has been able to preserve it, he deserves to be hailed as a true benefactor to his age and kind.

We have briefly spoken of the five parts that have already appeared; we will add a few words concerning some of the principal Byzantines, whose coming we most anxiously expect.

Procopius is the first, for he commences the series beginning with the times of Justinian. He is peculiarly, and more than any other writer, the connecting link between ancient and modern Italy, between the old Rome and the new. He composed eight books of Persian, Vandalic, and Gothic wars; the titles seem to imitate those of Appian; but the eighth book is miscellaneous, and ends A. D. 553. It is continued by Agathias, of whom we have already spoken, to A. D. 559. His ninth book is

apostate, and addressed letters to him, which he desired to answer, but was unable from want of language; his friend and patron, Cantacuzene, lent his tongue to Meletius and to truth; the proselyte supplied information, tinged, however, with the unfavourable colouring of a proselyte, and the Emperor found language. This work is comprised in four Apologies, and four Discourses, and is not very long. It would be foreign to our present purpose, and greatly exceed our limits, to discourse further concerning it. Although there are many curious passages in this production of the imperial theologian, we will only extract one, relating to a much-controverted subject. ‘The apostles and disciples of Christ wrote and taught what they saw, and what they heard from the mouth of Christ himself. Four, therefore, of the disciples of Christ wrote a gospel. One of them, named Matthew, *in Hebrew*, and he published this for the use of Palestine, or Jerusalem, and part of Africa: another, Mark, *in Latin*, for Achaia, and it was published for Italy and Rome, and indeed all the western nations: another, Luke, *in Greek*, and it was for the use of Asia, and Aethiopia, and Persia, and India, and Arabia; and the other, John, *in Greek* also, and it was published for parts of Europe and the islands, and wherever Greeks are found. Thus the gospel was diffused throughout the whole world, not by violence and compulsion, nor with the sword and with arms, but we find, that the apostles taught the word of God in charity, gladness, and humility.’—Apol. 4. We have here the distinct opinion of an eminent theologian on a disputed point, and it perhaps includes also the tradition of the Greek church.

The last part, to which no number is affixed, contains the two books of the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, ‘*de Ceremoniis Aulae Byzantinae*.’ Niebuhr speaks slightly of the subject of this work in his preface: ‘Scio ego,’ are his words, ‘libros Constantinianos de ceremoniis, quos inscriptio ipsa circa nugas versari prodit, a plurimis contemni planè ac derideri; neque negabo majorem prioris libri partem ita esse comparatam ut ingenuo homini nauseam moveat.’ The ingenious student, it is true, is not likely to be incited to penetrate into the ceremonial of the Byzantine court, when he finds, on turning over the pages, a chapter which appears to treat of the proper manner of cutting the hair of the prince, and which is headed thus: ‘Observanda in tonsione filii imperatoris.’—L. 2, c. 23. The *κούρευμα*, however, was a religious rite; and it is not impossible that many of these performances, the description of which is tiresome to read, were agreeable enough to look at; especially to the lower classes, for whose diversion they were

chiefly designed. Ceremonies are delightful to children and the common people, and they are sometimes pleasing even to the wise, perhaps through a sympathy in the pleasures of others. This treatise was first published by the learned Reiske, in the year 1751, at Leipsic, from a MS. which seemed to have been written by the same hand, with the same pen, and on the same day: ‘*Elegantia Scripturæ tanta apparet, ac si integrum volu-  
men non solum eâdem manu, sed eodem calamo eâdemque die,  
descriptum esset.*’ Though it is true that many ceremonies are of great and unknown antiquity—that Constantine explains the rites of the Greek Church and its liturgy in the tenth century—that he throws light upon several portions of history, and opens some new historical inquiries—we had rather that this thick volume had been postponed for some time. It would have served to conclude the Byzantine series, and would have gracefully closed the goodly procession.

This Constantine was born A. D. 905; but some attribute the work to another Constantine, who lived a century later, and are inclined to doubt, whether it be the production of Constantine, the son of Leo; chiefly because the author speaks of himself as being dead, and describes his own monument. The better opinion, however, seems to be, that these passages, (and they are few and unimportant), are additions and interpolations. An accurate description of the ceremonial of the court, from so high an authority, would, no doubt, be greatly esteemed at Constantinople, and we may easily believe that it was often copied, and that respect and gratitude towards the illustrious author, might suggest such insertions in passages which appeared to invite them. On this subject the curious may consult Reiske, a man in whom vivacity was nothing impaired by great learning. This quality is so apt to be overlaid and choked by erudition, that whenever a profound scholar has been able to preserve it, he deserves to be hailed as a true benefactor to his age and kind.

We have briefly spoken of the five parts that have already appeared; we will add a few words concerning some of the principal Byzantines, whose coming we most anxiously expect.

Procopius is the first, for he commences the series beginning with the times of Justinian. He is peculiarly, and more than any other writer, the connecting link between ancient and modern Italy, between the old Rome and the new. He composed eight books of Persian, Vandalic, and Gothic wars; the titles seem to imitate those of Appian; but the eighth book is miscellaneous, and ends A. D. 553. It is continued by Agathias, of whom we have already spoken, to A. D. 559. His ninth book is



called *Anecdota*, or, the Secret History. It was adorned with the learned notes of Alemannus; and notwithstanding our respect for the Empress Theodora, we hope it will be published without one omission. Procopius composed also six books concerning the imperial edifices—*de Edificiis*, *περὶ Κτισμάτων*; they are deformed with the grossest flattery, but they deserve, although they have rarely received, the examination of the architect. Of the two great and glorious monuments of Justinian, the one, his body of the Roman law, in every country, except England, has captivated the affections and arrested the attention of learned men; whilst the other has experienced from all nations unmerited neglect,—we mean the beautiful church of St Sophia. The cupola seems to display many of the resources of art, being of considerable span, and the height not exceeding one-sixth part of the diameter. It is a close cupola, without an aperture in the centre, but freely pierced with windows at the outer edge. As we study the plans of Grelot, we plainly trace in its structure the origin of those great miracles of the middle ages, the Cathedrals: it is in fact a cathedral inscribed in a square, or rectangle,—in an ancient temple. It was afterwards discovered that a cathedral could subsist by itself, and the circumscribed temple was omitted in subsequent erections. The egg-shell, in which it had been hatched, was removed; the young eagle stood alone, and gradually grew to be a noble bird.

We shall be glad to have in a moderate compass the Alexiad of Anna Comnena. We consider it a wonderful work for a female and a princess, especially in the eleventh century; although we do not, like some enthusiastic admirers, esteem the fair historian as a Minerva, and the tenth Muse: ‘decima Musarum’ et Pallas quædam Byzantine Græciæ.’

The ten books of Laonicus Chalcocondylas *De rebus Turcicis*, are valuable; and the singular account of England, and the manners of its inhabitants, by an Athenian of the fifteenth century, would afford a good specimen of the credulity of a religious zealot. We pass it over, however, and will extract a remarkable passage concerning Pope Joan, because we do not remember to have seen it cited by any of the disputants who have taken either side of the much-agitated question, as to the existence of her holiness:—‘As soon as a Pope dies, the cardinals assemble in a certain palace, and proceed to choose a successor; and when they have elected him, they carefully inquire into his sex, for it appears that formerly a woman was elevated in Rome to the papal chair, her sex not being manifested, because the men in Italy, and indeed in all the countries of the West, are closely shaved. And she became pregnant;

‘ and one day she went to mass, and the child was born during  
 ‘ the service, and was seen by all the people. On this account,  
 ‘ that there may be no doubt, they carefully enquire into the  
 ‘ sex of the new Pope, and proclaim aloud, “ Our Lord is a  
 ‘ man !” ’

The original will serve as a commentary on Hudibras: καθίζουσι  
 δε ἐπὶ σιμύποδος ὅπην ἔχοντος, ὥς καὶ τῶν ὄρχεων αὐτὲ ἐπιτρεμαμένων ἀπτεσ-  
 δαί τινα τῶν προσταχθέντων—δι’ ἃ δὴ ὥς ἐπινῶνται, καὶ μὴ πάνυ τοι ἐνδοι-  
 ἀζειν, ἀπτονται, καὶ ἀφάμενος ἐπιφωνεῖ, ἄρρην ἡμῖν ἐστὶν ὁ δεσπότης. Lib. 6.

We do not quote this as an authority in the case of the lady-  
 pope, but it proves how odious the shaving of the Western World  
 was in the eyes of a pious Greek. But that all the men in Rome  
 were closely shaved, he says, so that they could not be distin-  
 guished from women, this horrible profanation could not have  
 happened. We do not doubt, however, that it was a consolation  
 to an Eastern Christian to reflect, that even a female was too  
 good a bishop for men without one sentiment of orthodox reli-  
 gion in their hearts, or a single hair on their faces. To become  
 a heretic, or to buy a razor,—to part with the faith, or the beard,  
 are accordingly spoken of as being equally acts of black and  
 deadly guilt; and in describing the apostacy of Theodore Paleolo-  
 gus to the religion and manners of the Latins, they are enume-  
 rated by the historian in the same tone and sentence: ὅτι καὶ  
 γνώμη, καὶ πίστις, καὶ σχήματι, καὶ γενέειον κερᾶ, καὶ πᾶσιν ἔδεσιν, Λατίνους ἢ  
 ἀκραίφνης.—Nic. Greg. I. ix. c. 1. The Russians, who are at pre-  
 sent the most flourishing branch of the Greek church, still main-  
 tain the religion of the beard; the chins of their clergy are  
 usually furnished on a scale of magnificence, that is not un-  
 worthy even of their most ancient and venerable church.

George Phranza, or Phranzes, a man illustrious by his rank  
 and his misfortunes, has left us a history of the taking of Con-  
 stantinople by the Turks: he was a witness of the horrible scene,  
 and a large sufferer. Mr Gibbon speaks thus of his work:—  
 ‘ While so many MSS. of the Greek original are extant in the  
 ‘ libraries of Rome, Milan, the Escorial, &c. it is a matter of  
 ‘ shame and reproach, that we should be reduced to the Latin  
 ‘ version of James Pontanus, so deficient in accuracy and ele-  
 ‘ gance.’ The original at last appeared in folio, at Vienna, un-  
 polluted by Latin, in the year 1796, with the title, Χρονικὸν  
 Γεωργίου Φράντζη τῆ πρωτοβεβιαρίας. The long and learned preface,  
 except quotations, is in Greek; some curious engravings on  
 wood give a notion of the finery of the Byzantine court; and  
 there are other Constantinopolitan matters in this volume, of  
 which we cannot speak at present. Since the original has at last  
 appeared, and that entire, (for in the abstract of Pontanus, the

historical portions only were given,) we may cite in the Greek that passage, which Mr Gibbon quotes from the translation, (vol. vi. p. 503, 4to edition.) ‘*Ἐν ᾧ δὴ χρόνῳ καὶ μηνί, ἀνείλεν αὐτοχειρία τὸν φίλτατόν μὲ υἱὸν Ἰωάννην ὁ ἀσεβέστατος καὶ ἀπηνέεστατος Ἀμπαράς, ὃς δὴδεν ἐβέλετο τὴν ἀδέμιτον σοδομίαν πράξαι κατὰ τῆ παιδὸς χρόνῳ ὄντος δέκα τεσσάρων καὶ μηνῶν ὀκτὼ παρὰ ἡμέραν μίαν· κατὰ δὲ φρόνησιν καὶ ἡλικίαν ὥσαν πλειόνων ἐτῶν ἦν· οἱ μοι τῷ δυστυχῇ καὶ ἀθλίῳ γενέτη.*’

The office of Protovestiary, which Phranzes held, resembled that of Chamberlain, it is said, but it had a peculiarity: ‘*Id vero etiam proprium et singulare habet, quod si quid alienum viderit, aut lutum, aut quid aliud, ad imperatoris vestem, deponens ille umbellam aut tegmen capitis sui, extenta manu tollit aut purgat illud, non rogatus. Ex omnibus vero aliis principibus nemo auctoritatem habet faciendi istæc, sed ille solus.*’ This is a high privilege and responsibility; but under a despotic government, a man who may be permitted to take such liberties with the imperial person, must be trust-worthy, lest he should make the exercise of his office an opportunity for assassination. We hope, ere long, to receive from Bonn this work also, in a more cheap and commodious form.

It will sometimes be difficult, in publishing this series, to draw the line between civil and ecclesiastical history; to determine, for example, whether a writer of the fifteenth century, who has been truly said to have ‘the uncommon talent of placing each scene before the reader’s eye,’ and who presents a lively picture of the faded glory of the empire, ought to be admitted. We allude to the entertaining history of the Council of Florence, A. D. 1438, by Sylvester Sguropulus, or, if we may believe that the great ecclesiastic knew how to spell his own name, Syropulus. This remarkable work will always be read with a deep moral interest, independently of the usual sources of entertainment, being such an unusual conservation of intolerance,—a very Cerberus of theological bigotry. The author, a bigoted Greek, who relates, and bitterly complains of, the bigotry of the Latins, most unconsciously illustrates and details his own; and the editor, Robert Creighton, a staunch Protestant, labours in his preface and notes, and not altogether unsuccessfully, to surpass in bigotry the zealots of Rome and Constantinople. Of the Ecclesiastical writers, many are published in the Collections of Councils. The writings of the Greeks, touching ecclesiastical matters, are almost infinite: to have read all of them, if it were possible, would be as disgraceful as to be entirely ignorant of them. It is a salutary medicine for the odious presumption that grows out of

ignorance, to learn, at least, how much there is to be learned. But we must omit many authors, and various matters, of which we would willingly speak, and reluctantly leave a curious and interesting subject.

The present editors of the *Byzantine Historians*, (that we may state their claims to encouragement in a few words,) have, in some instances, done much themselves; in all cases, they have availed themselves of the best editions: they have adopted a convenient form, and a comfortable type, and have bestowed the utmost care on correctness. We shall be most happy to aid in attracting attention to a meritorious undertaking; and we are of opinion, that the little notice these volumes have hitherto received in Great Britain,—they have scarcely found a place even in our few public libraries,—is not creditable to us as a literary nation, or consonant with the high character, which it is desirable we should maintain, as patrons of all good letters.

---

ART. VI.—*Westminster Review*, (XXII. Art. 16,) on the *Strictures of the Edinburgh Review* (XCVIII. Art. 1,) on the *Utilitarian Theory of Government*, and the ‘*Greatest Happiness Principle*.’

WE have long been of opinion that the Utilitarians have owed all their influence to a mere delusion—that, while professing to have submitted their minds to an intellectual discipline of peculiar severity, to have discarded all sentimentality, and to have acquired consummate skill in the art of reasoning, they are decidedly inferior to the mass of educated men in the very qualities in which they conceive themselves to excel. They have undoubtedly freed themselves from the dominion of some absurd notions. But their struggle for intellectual emancipation has ended, as injudicious and violent struggles for political emancipation too often end, in a mere change of tyrants. Indeed, we are not sure that we do not prefer the venerable nonsense which holds prescriptive sway over the Ultra-Tory, to the upstart dynasty of prejudices and sophisms, by which the revolutionists of the moral world have suffered themselves to be enslaved.

The Utilitarians have sometimes been abused as intolerant, arrogant, irreligious,—as enemies of literature, of the fine arts, and of the domestic charities. They have been reviled for some things of which they were guilty, and for some of which they were innocent. But scarcely any body seems to have per-

ceived, that almost all their peculiar faults arise from the utter want both of comprehensiveness and of precision in their mode of reasoning. We have, for some time past, been convinced that this was really the case; and that, whenever their philosophy should be boldly and unsparingly scrutinized, the world would see that it had been under a mistake respecting them.

We have made the experiment, and it has succeeded far beyond our most sanguine expectations. A chosen champion of the School has come forth against us. A specimen of his logical abilities now lies before us; and we pledge ourselves to show, that no Prebendary at an Anti-Catholic meeting, no true-blue Baronet after the third bottle at a Pitt Club, ever displayed such utter incapacity of comprehending or answering an argument, as appears in the speculations of this Utilitarian apostle; that he does not understand our meaning, or Mr Mill's meaning, or Mr Bentham's meaning, or his own meaning; and that the various parts of his system—if the name of system can be so misapplied—directly contradict each other.

Having shown this, we intend to leave him in undisputed possession of whatever advantage he may derive from the last word. We propose only to convince the public that there is nothing in the far-famed logic of the Utilitarians, of which any plain man has reason to be afraid;—that this logic will impose on no man who dares to look it in the face.

The Westminster Reviewer begins by charging us with having misrepresented an important part of Mr Mill's argument.

'The first extract given by the Edinburgh Reviewers from the Essay was an insulated passage, purposely despoiled of what had preceded and what followed. The author had been observing, that "some profound and benevolent investigators of human affairs had adopted the conclusion, that of all the possible forms of government, absolute monarchy is the best." This is what the reviewers have omitted at the beginning. He then adds, as in the extract, that "Experience, *if we look only at the outside of the facts*, appears to be divided on this subject;" there are Caligulas in one place, and kings of Denmark in another. "As the surface of history affords, therefore, no certain principle of decision, *we must go beyond the surface*, and penetrate to the springs within." This is what the reviewers have omitted at the end.'

It is perfectly true, that our quotation from Mr Mill's Essay was, like most other quotations, preceded and followed by something which we did not quote. But if the Westminster Reviewer means to say, that either what preceded, or what followed, would, if quoted, have shown that we put a wrong interpretation on the passage which was extracted, he does not understand Mr Mill rightly.

Mr Mill undoubtedly says that, 'as the surface of history affords no certain principle of decision, we must go beyond the surface, and penetrate to the springs within.' But these expressions will admit of several interpretations. In what sense, then, does Mr Mill use them? If he means that we ought to inspect the facts with close attention, he means what is rational. But if he means that we ought to leave the facts, with all their apparent inconsistencies, unexplained—to lay down a general principle of the widest extent, and to deduce doctrines from that principle by syllogistic argument, without pausing to consider whether those doctrines be, or be not, consistent with the facts,—then he means what is irrational; and this is clearly what he does mean: For he immediately begins, without offering the least explanation of the contradictory appearances which he has himself described, to go beyond the surface in the following manner:—'That one human being will desire to render the person and property of another subservient to his pleasures, notwithstanding the pain or loss of pleasure which it may occasion to that other individual, is the foundation of government. The desire of the object implies the desire of the power necessary to accomplish the object.' And thus he proceeds to deduce consequences directly inconsistent with what he has himself stated respecting the situation of the Danish people.

If we assume that the object of government is the preservation of the persons and property of men, then we must hold that, wherever that object is attained, there the principle of good government exists. If that object be attained both in Denmark and in the United States of America, then that which makes government good must exist, under whatever disguise of title or name, both in Denmark and in the United States. If men lived in fear for their lives and their possessions under Nero and under the National Convention, it follows that the causes from which misgovernment proceeds, existed both in the despotism of Rome, and in the democracy of France. What, then, is that which, being found in Denmark and in the United States, and not being found in the Roman Empire, or under the administration of Robespierre, renders governments, widely differing in their external form, practically good? Be it what it may, it certainly is not that which Mr Mill proves *a priori* that it must be,—a democratic representative assembly. For the Danes have no such assembly.

The latent principle of good government ought to be tracked, as it appears to us, in the same manner in which Lord Bacon proposed to track the principle of Heat. Make as large a list as possible, said that great man, of those bodies in which, how-

ever widely they differ from each other in appearance, we perceive heat; and as large a list as possible of those which, while they bear a general resemblance to hot bodies, are nevertheless not hot. Observe the different degrees of heat in different hot bodies; and then, if there be something which is found in all hot bodies, and of which the increase or diminution is always accompanied by an increase or diminution of heat, we may hope that we have really discovered the object of our search. In the same manner, we ought to examine the constitution of all those communities in which, under whatever form, the blessings of good government are enjoyed; and to discover, if possible, in what they resemble each other, and in what they all differ from those societies in which the object of government is not attained. By proceeding thus we shall arrive, not indeed at a perfect theory of government, but at a theory which will be of great practical use, and which the experience of every successive generation will probably bring nearer and nearer to perfection.

The inconsistencies into which Mr Mill has been betrayed, by taking a different course, ought to serve as a warning to all speculators. Because Denmark is well governed by a monarch who, in appearance at least, is absolute, Mr Mill thinks, that the only mode of arriving at the true principles of government, is to deduce them *a priori* from the laws of human nature. And what conclusion does he bring out by this deduction? We will give it in his own words:—‘In the grand discovery of modern times, ‘the system of representation, the solution of all the difficulties, ‘both speculative and practical, will perhaps be found. If it cannot, we seem to be forced upon the extraordinary conclusion, ‘that good government is impossible.’ That the Danes are well governed without a representation, is a reason for deducing the theory of government from a general principle, from which it necessarily follows, that good government is impossible without a representation! We have done our best to put this question plainly; and we think, that if the Westminster Reviewer will read over what we have written twice or thrice with patience and attention, some glimpse of our meaning will break in, even on his mind.

Some objections follow, so frivolous and unfair, that we are almost ashamed to notice them.

‘When it was said that there was in Denmark a balanced contest between the king and the nobility, what was said was, that there was a balanced contest, but it did not last. It was balanced till something put an end to the balance; and so is every thing else. That such a balance will not last, is precisely what Mr Mill had demonstrated.’

Mr Mill, we positively affirm, pretends to demonstrate, not

merely that a balanced contest between the king and the aristocracy will not last, but that the chances are as infinity to one against the existence of such a balanced contest. This is a mere question of fact: We quote the words of the Essay, and defy the *Westminster Reviewer* to impeach our accuracy:—

‘It seems impossible that such equality should ever exist. How is it to be established? Or by what criterion is it to be ascertained? If there is no such criterion, it must, in all cases, be the result of chance. If so, the chances against it are as infinity to one.’

The *Reviewer* has confounded the division of power with the balance or equal division of power. Mr Mill says, that the division of power can never exist long, because it is next to impossible that the equal division of power should ever exist at all.

‘When Mr Mill asserted that it cannot be for the interest of either the monarchy or the aristocracy to combine with the democracy, it is plain he did not assert that if the monarchy and aristocracy were in doubtful contest with each other, they would not, either of them, accept of the assistance of the democracy. He spoke of their taking the side of the democracy; not of their allowing the democracy to take side with themselves.’

If Mr Mill meant any thing, he must have meant this—that the monarchy and the aristocracy will never forget their enmity to the democracy, in their enmity to each other.

‘The monarchy and aristocracy,’ says he, ‘have all possible motives for endeavouring to obtain unlimited power over the persons and property of the community. The consequence is inevitable. They have all possible motives for combining to obtain that power, and unless the people have power enough to be a match for both, they have no protection. The balance, therefore, is a thing, the existence of which, upon the best possible evidence, is to be regarded as impossible.’

If Mr Mill meant only what the *Westminster Reviewer* conceives him to have meant, his argument would leave the popular theory of the balance quite untouched. For it is the very theory of the balance, that the help of the people will be solicited by the nobles when hard pressed by the king, and by the king when hard pressed by the nobles; and that, as the price of giving alternate support to the crown and the aristocracy, they will obtain something for themselves, as the *Reviewer* admits that they have done in Denmark. If Mr Mill admits this, he admits the only theory of the balance of which we ever heard—that very theory which he has declared to be wild and chimerical. If he denies it, he is at issue with the *Westminster Reviewer* as to the phenomena of the Danish government.

We now come to a more important passage. Our opponent has discovered, as he conceives, a radical error which runs



through our whole argument, and vitiates every part of it. We suspect that we shall spoil his triumph.

‘ Mr Mill never asserted “ *that under no despotic government does any human being, except the tools of the sovereign, possess more than the necessities of life, and that the most intense degree of terror is kept up by constant cruelty.*” He said that absolute power leads to such results, “ *by infallible sequence, where power over a community is attained, and nothing checks.*” The critic on the Mount never made a more palpable misquotation.

‘ The spirit of this misquotation runs through every part of the reply of the Edinburgh Review that relates to the Essay on Government; and is repeated in as many shapes as the Roman pork. The whole description of “ Mr Mill’s argument against despotism,”—including the illustration from right-angled triangles and the square of the hypothenuse,—is founded on this invention of saying what an author has not said, and leaving unsaid what he has.’

We thought, and still think, for reasons which our readers will soon understand, that we represented Mr Mill’s principle quite fairly, and according to the rule of law and common sense, *ut res magis valeat quam pereat*. Let us, however, give him all the advantage of the explanation tendered by his advocate, and see what he will gain by it.

The Utilitarian doctrine then is, not that despots and aristocracies will always plunder and oppress the people to the last point, but that they will do so if nothing checks them.

In the first place, it is quite clear that the doctrine thus stated, is of no use at all, unless the force of the checks be estimated. The first law of motion is, that a ball once projected will fly on to all eternity with undiminished velocity, unless something checks. The fact is, that a ball stops in a few seconds after proceeding a few yards with very variable motion. Every man would wring his child’s neck, and pick his friend’s pocket, if nothing checked him. In fact, the principle thus stated, means only that governments will oppress, unless they abstain from oppressing. This is quite true, we own. But we might with equal propriety turn the maxim round, and lay it down as the fundamental principle of government, that all rulers will govern well, unless some motive interferes to keep them from doing so.

If there be, as the Westminster Reviewer acknowledges, certain checks which, under political institutions the most arbitrary in seeming, sometimes produce good government, and almost always place some restraint on the rapacity and cruelty of the powerful; surely the knowledge of those checks, of their nature, and of their effect, must be a most important part of the

science of government. Does Mr Mill say any thing upon this part of the subject? Not one word.

The line of defence now taken by the Utilitarians, evidently degrades Mr Mill's theory of government from the rank which, till within the last few months, was claimed for it by the whole sect. It is no longer a practical system, fit to guide statesmen, but merely a barren exercise of the intellect, like those propositions in mechanics in which the effect of friction and of the resistance of the air is left out of the question; and which, therefore, though correctly deduced from the premises, are in practice utterly false. For if Mr Mill professes to prove only that absolute monarchy and aristocracy are pernicious without checks,—if he allows that there are checks which produce good government, even under absolute monarchs and aristocracies,—and if he omits to tell us what those checks are, and what effects they produce under different circumstances, he surely gives us no information which can be of real utility.

But the fact is,—and it is most extraordinary that the Westminster Reviewer should not have perceived it,—that if once the existence of checks on the abuse of power in monarchies and aristocracies be admitted, the whole of Mr Mill's theory falls to the ground at once. This is so palpable, that, in spite of the opinion of the Westminster Reviewer, we must acquit Mr Mill of having intended to make such an admission. We still think that the words, 'where power over a community is attained, and 'nothing checks,' must not be understood to mean, that under a monarchical or aristocratical form of government, there can really be any check which can in any degree mitigate the wretchedness of the people.

For, all possible checks may be classed under two general heads,—want of will, and want of power. Now, if a king or an aristocracy, having the power to plunder and oppress the people, can want the will, all Mr Mill's principles of human nature must be pronounced unsound. He tells us, 'that the desire to possess unlimited power of inflicting pain upon others, is an inseparable part of human nature;' and that 'a chain of inference, close and strong to a most unusual degree,' leads to the conclusion, that those who possess this power will always desire to use it. It is plain, therefore, that, if Mr Mill's principles be sound, the check on a monarchical or an aristocratical government will not be the want of will to oppress.

If a king or an aristocracy, having, as Mr Mill tells us that they always must have, the will to oppress the people with the utmost severity, want the power, then the government, by whatever name it may be called, must be virtually a mixed govern-

ment, or a pure democracy : for it is quite clear that the people possess some power in the state—some means of influencing the nominal rulers. But Mr Mill has demonstrated that no mixed government can possibly exist, or at least that such a government must come to a very speedy end : therefore, every country in which people not in the service of the government have, for any length of time, been permitted to accumulate more than the bare means of subsistence, must be a pure democracy. That is to say, France before the Revolution, and Ireland during the last century, were pure democracies. Prussia, Austria, Russia, all the governments of the civilized world, are pure democracies. If this be not a *reductio ad absurdum*, we do not know what is.

The errors of Mr Mill proceed principally from that radical vice in his reasoning, which, in our last number, we described in the words of Lord Bacon. The Westminster Reviewer is unable to discover the meaning of our extracts from the *Novum Organum*, and expresses himself as follows :

‘ The quotations from Lord Bacon are misapplications, such as any body may make to any thing he dislikes. There is no more resemblance between pain, pleasure, motives, &c., and *substantia, generatio, corruptio, elementum, materia*,—than between lines, angles, magnitudes, &c., and the same.’

It would perhaps be unreasonable to expect that a writer who cannot understand his own English, should understand Lord Bacon’s Latin. We will, therefore, attempt to make our meaning clearer.

What Lord Bacon blames in the schoolmen of his time, is this,—that they reasoned syllogistically on words which had not been defined with precision ; such as moist, dry, generation, corruption, and so forth. Mr Mill’s error is exactly of the same kind. He reasons syllogistically about power, pleasure, and pain, without attaching any definite notion to any one of those words. There is no more resemblance, says the Westminster Reviewer, between pain and *substantia*, than between pain and a line or an angle. By his permission, in the very point to which Lord Bacon’s observation applies, Mr Mill’s subjects do resemble the *substantia* and *elementum* of the schoolmen, and differ from the lines and magnitudes of Euclid. We can reason *a priori* on mathematics, because we can define with an exactitude which precludes all possibility of confusion. If a mathematician were to admit the least laxity into his notions ; if he were to allow himself to be deluded by the vague sense which words bear in popular use, or by the aspect of an ill-drawn diagram ; if he were to forget in his reasonings that a point was indivisible, or that the definition of a line excluded breadth,

there would be no end to his blunders. The schoolmen tried to reason mathematically about things which had not been, and perhaps could not be, defined with mathematical accuracy. We know the result. Mr Mill has in our time attempted to do the same. He talks of power, for example, as if the meaning of the word power were as determinate as the meaning of the word circle. But when we analyze his speculations, we find that his notion of power is, in the words of Bacon, '*phantastica et male terminata.*'

There are two senses in which we may use the word *power*, and those words which denote the various distributions of power, as, for example, *monarchy*;—the one sense popular and superficial,—the other more scientific and accurate. Mr Mill, since he chose to reason *a priori*, ought to have clearly pointed out in which sense he intended to use words of this kind, and to have adhered inflexibly to the sense on which he fixed. Instead of doing this, he flies backwards and forwards from the one sense to the other, and brings out conclusions at last which suit neither.

The state of those two communities to which he has himself referred—the kingdom of Denmark and the empire of Rome—may serve to illustrate our meaning. Looking merely at the surface of things, we should call Denmark a despotic monarchy, and the Roman world, in the first century after Christ, an aristocratical republic. Caligula was, in theory, nothing more than a magistrate elected by the Senate, and subject to the Senate. That irresponsible dignity which, in the most limited monarchies of our time, is ascribed to the person of the sovereign, never belonged to the earlier Cæsars. The sentence of death which the great council of the commonwealth passed on Nero, was strictly according to the theory of the constitution. Yet, in fact, the power of the Roman Emperors approached nearer to absolute dominion than that of any prince in modern Europe. On the other hand, the King of Denmark, in theory the most despotic of princes, would, in practice, find it most perilous to indulge in cruelty and licentiousness. Nor is there, we believe, at the present moment, a single sovereign in our part of the world, who has so much real power over the lives of his subjects, as Robespierre, while he lodged at a chandler's and dined at a restaurateur's, exercised over the lives of those whom he called his fellow-citizens.

Mr Mill and the Westminster Reviewer seem to agree, that there cannot long exist, in any society, a division of power between a monarch, an aristocracy, and the people; or between any two of them. However the power be distributed, one of

the three parties will, according to them, inevitably monopolize the whole. Now, what is here meant by power? If Mr Mill speaks of the external semblance of power,—of power recognised by the theory of the constitution,—he is palpably wrong. In England, for example, we have had for ages the name and form of a mixed government, if nothing more. Indeed, Mr Mill himself owns, that there are appearances which have given colour to the theory of the balance, though he maintains that these appearances are delusive. But if he uses the word power in a deeper and philosophical sense, he is, if possible, still more in the wrong than on the former supposition. For if he had considered in what the power of one human being over other human beings must ultimately consist, he would have perceived, not only that there are mixed governments in the world, but that all the governments in the world, and all the governments which can even be conceived as existing in the world, are virtually mixed.

If a king possessed the lamp of Aladdin,—if he governed by the help of a genius, who carried away the daughters and wives of his subjects through the air to the royal *Parc-aux-cerfs*, and turned into stone every man who wagged a finger against his majesty's government, there would indeed be an unmixed despotism. But, fortunately, a ruler can be gratified only by means of his subjects. His power depends on their obedience; and, as any three or four of them are more than a match for him by himself, he can only enforce the unwilling obedience of some, by means of the willing obedience of others. Take any of those who are popularly called absolute princes—Napoleon for example. Could Napoleon have walked through Paris, cutting off the head of one person in every house which he passed? Certainly not without the assistance of an army. If not, why not? Because the people had sufficient physical power to resist him, and would have put forth that power in defence of their lives and of the lives of their children. In other words, there was a portion of power in the democracy under Napoleon. Napoleon might probably have indulged himself in such an atrocious freak of power if his army would have seconded him. But if his army had taken part with the people, he would have found himself utterly helpless; and even if they had obeyed his orders against the people, they would not have suffered him to decimate their own body. In other words, there was a portion of power in the hands of a minority of the people, that is to say, in the hands of an aristocracy, under the reign of Napoleon.

To come nearer home,—Mr Mill tells us that it is a mistake to imagine that the English government is mixed. He holds, we suppose, with all the politicians of the Utilitarian school, that

it is purely aristocratical. There certainly is an aristocracy in England, and we are afraid that their power is greater than it ought to be. They have power enough to keep up the game-laws and corn-laws; but they have not power enough to subject the bodies of men of the lowest class to wanton outrage at their pleasure. Suppose that they were to make a law, that any gentleman of two thousand a-year might have a day-labourer or a pauper flogged with a cat-of-nine-tails whenever the whim might take him. It is quite clear, that the first day on which such flagellation should be administered, would be the last day of the English aristocracy. In this point, and in many other points which might be named, the commonalty in our island enjoy a security quite as complete as if they exercised the right of universal suffrage. We say, therefore, that the English people have in their own hands a sufficient guarantee that in some points the aristocracy will conform to their wishes;—in other words, they have a certain portion of power over the aristocracy. Therefore the English government is mixed.

Wherever a king or an oligarchy refrains from the last extremity of rapacity and tyranny, through fear of the resistance of the people, there, the constitution, whatever it may be called, is in some measure democratical. The admixture of democratic power may be slight. It may be much slighter than it ought to be; but some admixture there is. Wherever a numerical minority, by means of superior wealth or intelligence, of political concert, or of military discipline, exercises a greater influence on the society than any other equal number of persons,—there, whatever the form of government may be called, a mixture of aristocracy does in fact exist. And wherever a single man, from whatever cause, is so necessary to the community, or to any portion of it, that he possesses more power than any other man, there is a mixture of monarchy. This is the philosophical classification of governments; and if we use this classification we shall find, not only that there are mixed governments, but that all governments are, and must always be, mixed. But we may safely challenge Mr Mill to give any definition of power, or to make any classification of governments, which shall bear him out in his assertion, that a lasting division of authority is impracticable.

It is evidently on the real distribution of power, and not on names and badges, that the happiness of nations must depend. The representative system, though doubtless a great and precious discovery in politics, is only one of the many modes in which the democratic part of the community can efficiently check the governing few. That certain men have been chosen as de-

puties of the people,—that there is a piece of paper stating such deputies to possess certain powers,—these circumstances in themselves constitute no security for good government. Such a constitution nominally existed in France; while, in fact, an oligarchy of committees and clubs trampled at once on the electors and the elected. Representation is a very happy contrivance for enabling large bodies of men to exert their power, with less risk of disorder than there would otherwise be. But, assuredly, it does not of itself give power. Unless a representative assembly is sure of being supported, in the last resort, by the physical strength of large masses, who have spirit to defend the constitution, and sense to defend it in concert, the mob of the town in which it meets may overawe it;—the howls of the listeners in its gallery may silence its deliberations;—an able and daring individual may dissolve it. And if that sense and that spirit of which we speak be diffused through a society, then, even without a representative assembly, that society will enjoy many of the blessings of good government.

Which is the better able to defend himself;—a strong man with nothing but his fists, or a paralytic cripple encumbered with a sword which he cannot lift? Such, we believe, is the difference between Denmark and some new republics in which the constitutional forms of the United States have been most sedulously imitated.

Look at the Long Parliament, on the day on which Charles came to seize the five members, and look at it again on the day when Cromwell stamped with his foot on its floor. On which day was its apparent power the greater? On which day was its real power the less? Nominally subject, it was able to defy the sovereign. Nominally sovereign, it was turned out of doors by its servant.

Constitutions are in politics what paper money is in commerce. They afford great facilities and conveniences. But we must not attribute to them that value which really belongs to what they represent. They are not power, but symbols of power, and will, in an emergency, prove altogether useless, unless the power for which they stand be forthcoming. The real power by which the community is governed, is made up of all the means which all its members possess of giving pleasure or pain to each other.

Great light may be thrown on the nature of a circulating medium by the phenomena of a state of barter. And in the same manner it may be useful to those who wish to comprehend the nature and operation of the outward signs of power, to look at communities in which no such signs exist; for example, at the

great community of nations. There we find nothing analogous to a constitution: But do we not find a government? We do in fact find government in its purest, and simplest, and most intelligible form. We see one portion of power acting directly on another portion of power. We see a certain police kept up; the weak to a certain degree protected; the strong to a certain degree restrained. We see the principle of the balance in constant operation. We see the whole system sometimes undisturbed by any attempt at encroachment for twenty or thirty years at a time; and all this is produced without a legislative assembly, or an executive magistracy—without tribunals, —without any code which deserves the name; solely by the mutual hopes and fears of the various members of the federation. In the community of nations, the first appeal is to physical force. In communities of men, forms of government serve to put off that appeal, and often render it unnecessary. But it is still open to the oppressed or the ambitious.

Of course, we do not mean to deny that a form of government will, after it has existed for a long time, materially affect the real distribution of power throughout the community. This is because those who administer a government, with their dependents, form a compact and disciplined body, which, acting methodically and in concert, is more powerful than any other equally numerous body which is inferior in organization. The power of rulers is not, as superficial observers sometimes seem to think, a thing *sui generis*. It is exactly similar in kind, though generally superior in amount, to that of any set of conspirators who plot to overthrow it. We have seen in our time the most extensive and the best organized conspiracy that ever existed—a conspiracy which possessed all the elements of real power in so great a degree, that it was able to cope with a strong government, and to triumph over it—the Catholic Association. An Utilitarian would tell us, we suppose, that the Irish Catholics had no portion of political power whatever on the first day of the late Session of Parliament.

Let us really go beyond the surface of facts: Let us, in the sound sense of the words, penetrate to the springs within; and the deeper we go, the more reason shall we find to smile at those theorists who hold that the sole hope of the human race is in a rule-of-three sum and a ballot-box.

We must now return to the Westminster Reviewer. The following paragraph is an excellent specimen of his peculiar mode of understanding and answering arguments.

'The reply to the argument against "saturation," supplies its own answer. The reason why it is of no use to try to "saturate," is precisely



what the Edinburgh Reviewers have suggested,—“*that there is no limit to the number of thieves.*” There are the thieves, and the thieves’ cousins,—with their men-servants, their maid-servants, and their little ones, to the fortieth generation. It is true, that “a man cannot become a king or a member of the aristocracy whenever he chooses;” but if there is to be no limit to the depredators except their own inclination to increase and multiply, the situation of those who are to suffer is as wretched as it needs be. It is impossible to define what *are* “corporal pleasures.” A Duchess of Cleveland was a “corporal pleasure.” The most disgraceful period in the history of any nation,—that of the Restoration,—presents an instance of the length to which it is possible to go in an attempt to “saturate” with pleasures of this kind.’

To reason with such a writer is like talking to a deaf man, who catches at a stray word, makes answer beside the mark, and is led further and further into error by every attempt to explain. Yet, that our readers may fully appreciate the abilities of the new philosophers, we shall take the trouble to go over some of our ground again.

Mr Mill attempts to prove, that there is no point of saturation with the objects of human desire. He then takes it for granted that men have no objects of desire but those which can be obtained only at the expense of the happiness of others. Hence he infers that absolute monarchs and aristocracies will necessarily oppress and pillage the people to a frightful extent.

We answered in substance thus: There are two kinds of objects of desire; those which give mere bodily pleasure, and those which please through the medium of associations. Objects of the former class, it is true, a man cannot obtain without depriving somebody else of a share: But then with these every man is soon satisfied. A king or an aristocracy cannot spend any very large portion of the national wealth on the mere pleasures of sense. With the pleasures which belong to us as reasoning and imaginative beings we are never satiated, it is true: But then, on the other hand, many of those pleasures can be obtained without injury to any person, and some of them can be obtained only by doing good to others.

The Westminster Reviewer, in his former attack on us, laughed at us for saying, that a king or an aristocracy could not be easily satiated with the pleasures of sense, and asked why the same course was not tried with thieves. We were not a little surprised at so silly an objection from the pen, as we imagined, of Mr Bentham. We returned, however, a very simple answer. There is no limit to the number of thieves. Any man who chooses can steal: But a man cannot become a member of the aristocracy, or a king, whenever he chooses. To satiate one thief, is to tempt twenty other people to steal. But by satiating one king

or five hundred nobles with bodily pleasures, we do not produce more kings or more nobles. The answer of the Westminster Reviewer we have quoted above; and it will amply repay our readers for the trouble of examining it. We never read any passage which indicated notions so vague and confused. The number of the thieves, says our Utilitarian, is not limited. For there are the dependents and friends of the king and of the nobles. Is it possible that he should not perceive that this comes under a different head? The bodily pleasures which a man in power dispenses among his creatures, are bodily pleasures as respects his creatures, no doubt. But the pleasure which he derives from bestowing them is not a bodily pleasure. It is one of those pleasures which belong to him as a reasoning and imaginative being. No man of common understanding can have failed to perceive, that when we said that a king or an aristocracy might easily be supplied to satiety with sensual pleasures, we were speaking of sensual pleasures directly enjoyed by themselves. But 'it is impossible,' says the Reviewer, 'to define what are corporal pleasures.' Our brother would indeed, we suspect, find it a difficult task; nor, if we are to judge of his genius for classification from the specimen which immediately follows, would we advise him to make the attempt. 'A Duchess of Cleveland was a corporal pleasure.' And to this wise remark is appended a note, setting forth that Charles the Second gave to the Duchess of Cleveland the money which he ought to have spent on the war with Holland. We scarcely know how to answer a man who unites so much pretension to so much ignorance. There are among the many Utilitarians who talk about Hume, Condillac, and Hartley, a few who have read those writers. Let the Reviewer ask one of these what he thinks on the subject. We shall not undertake to whip a pupil of so little promise through his first course of metaphysics. We shall, therefore, only say—leaving him to guess and wonder what we can mean—that in our opinion, the Duchess of Cleveland was not a merely corporal pleasure,—that the feeling which leads a prince to prefer one woman to all others, and to lavish the wealth of kingdoms on her, is a feeling which can only be explained by the law of association.

But we are tired, and even more ashamed than tired, of exposing these blunders. The whole article is of a piece. One passage, however, we must select, because it contains a very gross misrepresentation.

'*"They never alluded to the French Revolution for the purpose of proving that the poor were inclined to rob the rich."*—They only said, "as

soon as the poor *again* began to compare their cottages and salads with the hotels and banquets of the rich, there would have been another scramble for property, another general confiscation,"' &c.

We said, that, *if Mr Mill's principles of human nature were correct*, there would have been another scramble for property, and another confiscation. We particularly pointed this out in our last article. We showed the Westminster Reviewer that he had misunderstood us. We dwelt particularly on the condition which was introduced into our statement. We said that we had not given, and did not mean to give, any opinion of our own. And after this, the Westminster Reviewer thinks proper to repeat his former misrepresentation, without taking the least notice of that qualification to which we, in the most marked manner, called his attention.

We hasten on to the most curious part of the article under our consideration—the defence of the ‘greatest happiness principle.’ The Reviewer charges us with having quite mistaken its nature.

‘All that they have established is, that they do not understand it. Instead of the truism of the Whigs, “that the greatest happiness is the greatest happiness,” what Mr Bentham had demonstrated, or at all events had laid such foundations that there was no trouble in demonstrating, was, that the greatest happiness of the individual was, in the long run, to be obtained by pursuing the greatest happiness of the aggregate.’

It was distinctly admitted by the Westminster Reviewer, as we remarked in our last article, that he could give no answer to the question,—why governments should attempt to produce the greatest possible happiness? The Reviewer replies thus:—

‘Nothing of the kind will be admitted at all. In the passage thus selected to be tacked to the other, the question started was, concerning “the object of government;” in which government was spoken of as an operation, not as any thing that is capable of feeling pleasure or pain. In this sense it is true enough, that *ought* is not predicable of governments.’

We will quote, once again, the passage which we quoted in our last Number, and we really hope that our brother critic will feel something like shame while he peruses it.

‘The real answer appeared to be, that men at large *ought* not to allow a government to afflict them with more evil or less good, than they can help. What a *government* ought to do, is a mysterious and searching question, which those may answer who know what it means; but what other men ought to do, is a question of no mystery at all. The word *ought*, if it means any thing, must have reference to some kind of interest or motives; and what interest a government has in doing right, when it happens to be interested in doing wrong, is a question for the school-men. The fact appears to be, that *ought* is not predicable of governments. The

question is not, why governments are bound not to do this or that, but why other men should let them if they can help it. The point is not to determine why the lion should not eat sheep, but why men should not eat their own mutton if they can.'

We defy the Westminster Reviewer to reconcile this passage with the 'general happiness principle,' as he now states it. He tells us, that he meant by government, not the people invested with the powers of government, but a mere *operation* incapable of feeling pleasure or pain. We say, that he meant the people invested with the powers of government, and nothing else. It is true, that *ought* is not predicable of an operation. But who would ever dream of raising any question about the *duties* of an operation? What did the Reviewer mean by saying, that a government could not be interested in doing right because it was interested in doing wrong? Can an operation be interested in either? And what did he mean by his comparison about the lion? Is a lion an operation incapable of pain or pleasure? And what did he mean by the expression, 'other men,' so obviously opposed to the word 'government?' But let the public judge between us. It is superfluous to argue a point so clear.

The Reviewer does indeed seem to feel that his expressions cannot be explained away, and attempts to shuffle out of the difficulty by owning, that 'the double meaning of the word government was not got clear of without confusion.' He has now, at all events, he assures us, made himself master of Mr Bentham's philosophy. The real and genuine 'greatest happiness principle' is, that the greatest happiness of every individual is identical with the greatest happiness of society; and all other 'greatest happiness principles' whatever, are counterfeits. 'This,' says he, 'is the spirit of Mr Bentham's principle; and if there is any thing opposed to it in any former statement, it may be corrected by the present.'

Assuredly, if a fair and honourable opponent had, in discussing a question so abstruse as that concerning the origin of moral obligation, made some unguarded admission inconsistent with the spirit of his doctrines, we should not be inclined to triumph over him. But no tenderness is due to a writer, who, in the very act of confessing his blunders, insults those by whom his blunders have been detected, and accuses them of misunderstanding what, in fact, he has himself mis-stated.

The whole of this transaction illustrates excellently the real character of this sect. A paper comes forth, professing to contain a full developement of the 'greatest happiness principle,' with the latest improvements of Mr Bentham. The

writer boasts, that his article has the honour of being the announcement and the organ of this wonderful discovery, which is to make 'the bones of sages and patriots stir within their tombs.' This 'magnificent principle' is then stated thus: Mankind ought to pursue their greatest happiness. But there are persons whose interest is opposed to the greatest happiness of mankind. *Ought* is not predicable of such persons. For the word *ought* has no meaning, unless it be used with reference to some interest.

We answered, with much more lenity than we should have shown to such nonsense, had it not proceeded, as we supposed, from Mr Bentham, that interest was synonymous with greatest happiness; and that, therefore, if the word *ought* has no meaning, unless used with reference to interest, then, to say that mankind ought to pursue their greatest happiness, is simply to say, that the greatest happiness is the greatest happiness; that every individual pursues his own happiness; that either what he thinks his happiness must coincide with the greatest happiness of society, or not; that if what he thinks his happiness coincides with the greatest happiness of society, he will attempt to promote the greatest happiness of society, whether he ever heard of the 'greatest happiness principle' or not; and that, by the admission of the Westminster Reviewer, if his happiness is inconsistent with the greatest happiness of society, there is no reason why he should promote the greatest happiness of society. Now, that there are individuals who think that for their happiness which is not for the greatest happiness of society, is evident. The Westminster Reviewer allowed that some of these individuals were in the right; and did not pretend to give any reason which could induce any one of them to think himself in the wrong. So that the 'magnificent principle' turned out to be, either a truism or a contradiction in terms; either this maxim — 'Do what you do;' or this maxim, 'Do what you cannot do.'

The Westminster Reviewer had the wit to see that he could not defend this palpable nonsense; but, instead of manfully owning that he had misunderstood the whole nature of the 'greatest happiness principle' in the summer, and had obtained new light during the autumn, he attempts to withdraw the former principle unobserved, and to substitute another, directly opposed to it, in its place; clamouring all the time against our unfairness, like one who, while changing the cards, diverts the attention of the table from his sleight of hand, by vociferating charges of foul play against other people.

The 'greatest happiness principle' for the present quarter is then this,—that every individual will best promote his own hap-

piness in this world, religious considerations being left out of the question, by promoting the greatest happiness of the whole species. And this principle, we are told, holds good with respect to kings and aristocracies, as well as with other people.

'It is certain that the individual operators in any government, if they were thoroughly intelligent and entered into a perfect calculation of all existing chances, would seek for their own happiness in the promotion of the general; which brings them, if they knew it, under Mr Bentham's rule. The mistake of supposing the contrary, lies in confounding criminals who have had the luck to escape punishment, with those who have the risk still before them. Suppose, for instance, a member of the House of Commons were at this moment to debate within himself, whether it would be for his ultimate happiness to begin, according to his ability, to misgovern. If he could be sure of being as lucky as some that are dead and gone, there might be difficulty in finding him an answer. But he is *not* sure; and never can be, till he is dead. He does not know that he is not close upon the moment, when misgovernment such as he is tempted to contemplate, will be made a terrible example of. It is not fair to pick out the instance of the thief that has died unchanged. The question is, whether thieving is at this moment an advisable trade to begin, with all the possibilities of hanging not got over? This is the spirit of Mr Bentham's principle; and if there is any thing opposed to it in any former statement, it may be corrected by the present.'

We hope that we have now at last got to the real 'magnificent principle,'—to the principle which is really to make 'the bones of the sages and patriots stir.' What effect it may produce on the bones of the dead we shall not pretend to decide; but we are sure that it will do very little for the happiness of the living.

In the first place, nothing is more certain than this, that the Utilitarian theory of government, as developed in Mr Mill's Essay, and in all the other works on the subject which have been put forth by the sect, rests on these two principles,—that men follow their interest, and that the interest of individuals may be, and in fact perpetually is, opposed to the interest of society. Unless these two principles be granted, Mr Mill's Essay does not contain one sound sentence. All his arguments against monarchy and aristocracy, all his arguments in favour of democracy, nay, the very argument by which he shows that there is any necessity for having government at all, must be rejected as utterly worthless.

This is so palpable, that even the Westminster Reviewer, though not the most clear-sighted of men, could not help seeing it. Accordingly, he attempts to guard himself against the objection, after the manner of such reasoners, by committing two blunders instead of one. 'All this,' says he, 'only shows that

‘the members of a government would do well if they were all-  
‘wise;’ and he proceeds to tell us, that as rulers are not all-  
wise, they will invariably act against this principle wherever  
they can, so that the democratical checks will still be necessary  
to produce good government.

No form which human folly takes is so richly and exquisitely laughable as the spectacle of an Utilitarian in a dilemma. What earthly good can there be in a principle upon which no man will act until he is all-wise? A certain most important doctrine, we are told, has been demonstrated so clearly, that it ought to be the foundation of the science of government. And yet the whole frame of government is to be constituted, exactly as if this fundamental doctrine were false, and on the supposition that no human being will ever act as if he believed it to be true!

The whole argument of the Utilitarians, in favour of universal suffrage, proceeds on the supposition that even the rudest and most uneducated men cannot, for any length of time, be deluded into acting against their own true interest. Yet now they tell us that, in all aristocratical communities, the higher and more educated class will, not occasionally, but invariably, act against its own interest. Now, the only use of proving any thing, as far as we can see, is that people may believe it. To say that a man does what he believes to be against his happiness, is a contradiction in terms. If, therefore, government and laws are to be constituted on the supposition on which Mr Mill’s Essay is founded, that all individuals will, whenever they have power over others put into their hands, act in opposition to the general happiness, then government and laws must be constituted on the supposition that no individual believes, or ever will believe, his own happiness to be identical with the happiness of society. That is to say, government and laws are to be constituted on the supposition that no human being will ever be satisfied by Mr Bentham’s proof of his ‘greatest happiness principle,’—a supposition which may be true enough, but which says little, we think, for the principle in question.

But where has this principle been demonstrated? We are curious, we confess, to see this demonstration which is to change the face of the world, and yet is to convince nobody. The most amusing circumstance is, that the Westminster Reviewer himself does not seem to know whether the principle has been demonstrated or not. ‘Mr Bentham,’ he says, ‘has demonstrated it, or at all events has laid such foundations that there is no trouble in demonstrating it.’ Surely it is rather strange that such a matter should be left in doubt. The Reviewer proposed, in his

former article, a slight verbal emendation in the statement of the principle ; he then announced that the principle had received its last improvement ; and gloried in the circumstance that the Westminster Review had been selected as the organ of that improvement. Did it never occur to him that one slight improvement to a doctrine is to prove it ?

Mr Bentham has not demonstrated the 'greatest happiness principle,' as now stated. He is far too wise a man to think of demonstrating any such thing. In those sections of his *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, to which the Reviewer refers us in his note, there is not a word of the kind. Mr Bentham says, most truly, that there are no occasions in which a man has not *some* motives for consulting the happiness of other men ; and he proceeds to set forth what those motives are—sympathy on all occasions, and the love of reputation on most occasions. This is the very doctrine which we have been maintaining against Mr Mill and the Westminster Reviewer. The principal charge which we brought against Mr Mill was, that those motives to which Mr Bentham ascribes so much influence, were quite left out of consideration in his theory. The Westminster Reviewer, in the very article now before us, abuses us for saying, in the spirit and almost in the words of Mr Bentham, that 'there is a certain check to the rapacity and cruelty of men in their desire of the good opinion of others.' But does this principle, in which we fully agree with Mr Bentham, go the length of the new 'greatest happiness principle?' The question is not whether men have *some* motives for promoting the greatest happiness, but whether the *stronger* motives be those which impel them to promote the greatest happiness. That this would always be the case, if men knew their own worldly interests, is the assertion of the Reviewer. As he expresses some doubt whether Mr Bentham has demonstrated this or not, we would advise him to set the point at rest by giving his own demonstration.

The Reviewer has not attempted to give a general composition of the 'greatest happiness principle;' but he has tried to prove that it holds good in one or two particular cases. And even in those particular cases he has utterly failed. A man, says he, who calculated the chances fairly, would perceive that it would be for his greatest happiness to abstain from stealing ; for a thief runs a greater risk of being hanged than an honest man.

It would have been wise, we think, in the Westminster Reviewer, before he entered on a discussion of this sort, to settle in what human happiness consists. Each of the ancient sects of



philosophy held some tenet on this subject which served for a distinguishing badge. The *summum bonum* of the Utilitarians, as far as we can judge from the passage which we are now considering, is the not being hanged.

That it is an unpleasant thing to be hanged, we most willingly concede to our brother. But that the whole question of happiness or misery resolves itself into this single point, we cannot so easily admit. We must look at the thing purchased, as well as the price paid for it. A thief, assuredly, runs a greater risk of being hanged than a labourer; and so an officer in the army runs a greater risk of being shot than a banker's clerk; and a governor of India runs a greater risk of dying of cholera than a lord of the bedchamber. But does it therefore follow that every man, whatever his habits or feelings may be, would, if he knew his own happiness, become a clerk rather than a cornet, or goldstick in waiting rather than governor of India?

Nothing can be more absurd than to suppose, like the Westminster Reviewer, that thieves steal only because they do not calculate the chances of being hanged as correctly as honest men. It never seems to have occurred to him as possible, that a man may so greatly prefer the life of a thief to the life of a labourer, that he may determine to brave the risk of detection and punishment, though he may even think that risk greater than it really is. And how, on Utilitarian principles, is such a man to be convinced that he is in the wrong? 'You will be found out.'—'Undoubtedly.'—'You will be hanged within two years.'—'I expect to be hanged within one year.'—'Then why do you pursue this lawless mode of life?'—'Because I would rather live for one year with plenty of money, dressed like a gentleman, eating and drinking of the best, frequenting public places, and visiting a dashing mistress, than break stones on the road, or sit down to the loom, with the certainty of attaining a good old age. It is my humour. Are you answered?'

Aking, says the Reviewer again, would govern well if he were wise, for fear of provoking his subjects to insurrection. Therefore, the true happiness of a king is identical with the greatest happiness of society. Tell Charles II. that if he will be constant to his queen, sober at table, regular at prayers, frugal in his expenses, active in the transaction of business; if he will drive the herd of slaves, buffoons, and procurers from Whitehall, and make the happiness of his people the rule of his conduct, he will have a much greater chance of reigning in comfort to an advanced age; that his profusion and tyranny have exasperated his subjects, and may, perhaps, bring him to an end as terrible as his father's. He might answer, that he saw the danger,

but that life was not worth having without ease and vicious pleasures. And what has our philosopher to say? Does he not see that it is no more possible to reason a man out of liking a short life and a merry one more than a long life and a dull one, than to reason a Greenlander out of his train oil? We may say that the tastes of the thief and the tyrant differ from ours; but what right have we to say, looking at this world alone, that they do not pursue their greatest happiness very judiciously?

It is the grossest ignorance of human nature to suppose that another man calculates the chances differently from us, merely because he does what, in his place, we should not do. Every man has tastes and propensities, which he is disposed to gratify at a risk and expense, which people of different temperaments and habits think extravagant. 'Why,' says Horace, 'does one brother like to lounge in the forum, to play in the Campus, and to anoint himself in the baths, so well, that he would not put himself out of his way for all the wealth of the richest plantations of the East; while the other toils from sunrise to sunset for the purpose of increasing his fortune?' Horace attributes the diversity to the influence of the Genius and the natal star: and eighteen hundred years have taught us only to disguise our ignorance beneath a more philosophical language.

We think, therefore, that the Westminster Reviewer, even if we admit his calculation of the chances to be right, does not make out his case. But he appears to us to miscalculate chances more grossly than any person who ever acted or speculated in this world. 'It is for the happiness,' says he, 'of a member of the House of Commons to govern well; for he never can tell that he is not close on the moment when misgovernment will be terribly punished: if he was sure that he should be as lucky as his predecessors, it might be for his happiness to misgovern; but he is not sure.' Certainly a member of Parliament is not sure that he shall not be torn in pieces by a mob, or guillotined by a revolutionary tribunal, for his opposition to reform. Nor is the Westminster Reviewer sure that he shall not be hanged for writing in favour of universal suffrage. We may have democratical massacres. We may also have aristocratical proscriptions. It is not very likely, thank God, that we should see either. But the radical, we think, runs as much danger as the aristocrat. As to our friend, the Westminster Reviewer, he, it must be owned, has as good a right as any man on his side, '*Antoni gladios contemnere.*' But take the man whose votes, ever since he has sat in Parliament, have been the most uniformly bad, and oppose him to the man whose votes have been the most uniform-

ly good. The *Westminster Reviewer* would probably select Mr Sadler and Mr Hume. Now, does any rational man think,—will the *Westminster Reviewer* himself say,—that Mr Sadler runs more risk of coming to a miserable end, on account of his public conduct, than Mr Hume? Mr Sadler does not know that he is not close on the moment when he will be made an example of; for Mr Sadler knows, if possible, less about the future than about the past. But he has no more reason to expect that he shall be made an example of, than to expect that London will be swallowed up by an earthquake next spring; and it would be as foolish in him to act on the former supposition as on the latter. There is a risk; for there is a risk of every thing which does not involve a contradiction; but it is a risk from which no man in his wits would give a shilling to be insured. Yet our *Westminster Reviewer* tells us, that this risk alone, apart from all considerations of religion, honour, or benevolence, would, as a matter of mere calculation, induce a wise member of the House of Commons to refuse any emoluments which might be offered him as the price of his support to pernicious measures.

We have hitherto been examining cases proposed by our opponent. It is now our turn to propose one, and we beg that he will spare no wisdom in solving it.

A thief is condemned to be hanged. On the eve of the day fixed for the execution, a turnkey enters his cell, and tells him that all is safe, that he has only to slip out, that his friends are waiting in the neighbourhood with disguises, and that a passage is taken for him in an American packet. Now, it is clearly for the greatest happiness of society that the thief should be hanged, and the corrupt turnkey exposed and punished. Will the *Westminster Reviewer* tell us, that it is for the greatest happiness of the thief to summon the head jailer, and tell the whole story? Now, either it is for the greatest happiness of a thief to be hanged, or it is not. If it is, then the argument, by which the *Westminster Reviewer* attempts to prove, that men do not promote their own happiness by thieving, falls to the ground. If it is not, then there are men whose greatest happiness is at variance with the greatest happiness of the community.

To sum up our arguments shortly, we say, that the ‘greatest happiness principle,’ as now stated, is diametrically opposed to the principle stated in the *Westminster Review* three months ago.

We say, that if the ‘greatest happiness principle,’ as now stated, be sound, Mr Mill’s *Essay*, and all other works concerning Government, which, like that *Essay*, proceed on the suppo-

sition, that individuals may have an interest opposed to the greatest happiness of society, are fundamentally erroneous.

We say, that those who hold this principle to be sound, must be prepared to maintain, either that monarchs and aristocracies may be trusted to govern the community, or else that men cannot be trusted to follow their own interest, when that interest is demonstrated to them.

We say, that if men cannot be trusted to follow their own interest, when that interest has been demonstrated to them, then the Utilitarian arguments, in favour of universal suffrage, are good for nothing.

We say, that the 'greatest happiness principle' has not been proved; that it cannot be generally proved; that even in the particular cases selected by the Reviewer it is not clear that the principle is true; and that many cases might be stated in which the common sense of mankind would at once pronounce it to be false.

We now leave the Westminster Reviewer to alter and amend his 'magnificent principle' as he thinks best. Unlimited, it is false. Properly limited, it will be barren. The 'greatest happiness principle' of the 1st of July, as far as we could discern its meaning through a cloud of rodomontade, was an idle truism. The 'greatest happiness principle' of the 1st of October is, in the phrase of the American newspapers, 'important if true.' But unhappily it is not true. It is not our business to conjecture what new maxim is to make the bones of sages and patriots stir on the 1st of December. We can only say, that, unless it be something infinitely more ingenious than its two predecessors, we shall leave it unmolested. The Westminster Reviewer may, if he pleases, indulge himself like Sultan Schahriar, with espousing a rapid succession of virgin theories. But we must beg to be excused from playing the part of the vizier, who regularly attended on the day after the wedding to strangle the new Sultana.

The Westminster Reviewer charges us with urging it as an objection to the 'greatest happiness principle,' that, 'it is included in the Christian morality.' This is a mere fiction of his own. We never attacked the morality of the Gospel. We blamed the Utilitarians for claiming the credit of a discovery, when they had merely stolen that morality, and spoiled it in the stealing. They have taken the precept of Christ, and left the motive; and they demand the praise of a most wonderful and beneficial invention, when all that they have done has been to make a most useful maxim useless by separating it from its sanction. On religious principles, it is true that every indivi-

dual will best promote his own happiness by promoting the happiness of others. But if religious considerations be left out of the question, it is not true. If we do not reason on the supposition of a future state, where is the motive? If we do reason on that supposition, where is the discovery?

The Westminster Reviewer tells us, that 'we wish to see the science of Government unsettled, because we see no prospect of a settlement which accords with our interests.' His angry eagerness to have questions settled resembles that of a judge in one of Dryden's plays—the *Amphitryon*, we think—who wishes to decide a cause after hearing only one party, and when he has been at last compelled to listen to the statement of the defendant, flies into a passion, and exclaims, 'There now, sir! See what you have done. The case was quite clear a minute ago; and you must come and puzzle it!' He is the zealot of a sect. We are searchers after truth. He wishes to have the question settled. We wish to have it sifted first. The querulous manner in which we have been blamed for attacking Mr Mill's system, and propounding no system of our own, reminds us of the horror with which that shallow dogmatist, Epicurus, the worst parts of whose nonsense the Utilitarians have attempted to revive, shrank from the keen and searching scepticism of the second Academy.

It is not our fault that an experimental science of vast extent does not admit of being settled by a short demonstration;—that the subtilty of nature, in the moral as in the physical world, triumphs over the subtilty of syllogism. The quack who declares on affidavit that, by using his pills, and attending to his printed directions, hundreds who had been dismissed incurable from the hospitals, have renewed their youth like the eagles, may, perhaps, think that Sir Henry Hallford, when he feels the pulses of patients, enquires about their symptoms, and prescribes a different remedy to each, is unsettling the science of medicine for the sake of a fee.

If, in the course of this controversy, we have refrained from expressing any opinion respecting the political institutions of England, it is not because we have not an opinion, or because we shrink from avowing it. The Utilitarians, indeed, conscious that their boasted theory of government would not bear investigation, were desirous to turn the dispute about Mr Mill's Essay into a dispute about the Whig party, rotten boroughs, unpaid magistrates, and ex-officio informations. When we blamed them for talking nonsense, they cried out that they were insulted for being reformers,—just as poor Ancient Pistol swore that the

scars which he had received from the cudgel of Fluellen were got in the Galkia wars. We, however, did not think it desirable to mix up political questions, about which the public mind is violently agitated, with a great problem in moral philosophy.

Our notions about Government are not, however, altogether unsettled. We have an opinion about parliamentary reform, though we have not arrived at that opinion by the royal road which Mr Mill has opened for the explorers of political science. As we are taking leave, probably for the last time, of this controversy, we will state very concisely what our doctrines are. On some future occasion we may, perhaps, explain and defend them at length.

Our fervent wish, and, we will add, our sanguine hope, is, that we may see such a reform of the House of Commons as may render its votes the express image of the opinion of the middle orders of Britain. A pecuniary qualification we think absolutely necessary; and in settling its amount, our object would be to draw the line in such a manner, that every decent farmer and shopkeeper might possess the elective franchise. We should wish to see an end put to all the advantages which particular forms of property possess over other forms, and particular portions of property over other equal portions. And this would content us. Such a reform would, according to Mr Mill, establish an aristocracy of wealth, and leave the community without protection, and exposed to all the evils of unbridled power. Most willingly would we stake the whole controversy between us on the success of the experiment which we propose.

---

ART. VII.—*Sermons and Tracts ; including Remarks on the Character and Writings of Milton, and of Fenelon ; and an Analysis of the Character of Napoleon Bonaparte.* By W. E. Channing, D.D. of Boston, America. 8vo. London: Reprinted 1829.

OF the later American writers, who, besides Dr Channing, have acquired some reputation in England, we can only recollect Mr Washington Irving, Mr Brown, and Mr Cooper. To the first of these we formerly paid an ample tribute of respect; nor do we wish to retract a tittle of what we said on that occasion, or of the praise due to him for brilliancy, ease, and a faultless equability of style. Throughout his polished pages, no thought shocks by its extravagance, no word offends by vulgarity

or affectation. All is gay, but guarded,—heedless, but sensitive of the smallest blemish. We cannot deny it—nor can we conceal it from ourselves or the world, if we would—that he is, at the same time, deficient in nerve and originality. Almost all his sketches are like patterns taken in silk paper from our classic writers;—the traditional manners of the last age are still kept up (stuffed in glass cases) in Mr Irving's modern version of them. The only variation is in the transposition of dates; and herein the author is chargeable with a fond and amiable anachronism. He takes Old England for granted as he finds it described in our stock-books of a century ago—gives us a Sir Roger de Coverley in the year 1819, instead of the year 1709; and supposes old English hospitality and manners, relegated from the metropolis, to have taken refuge somewhere in Yorkshire, or the fens of Lincolnshire. In some sequestered spot or green savannah, we can conceive Mr Irving enchanted with the style of the wits of Queen Anne;—in the bare, broad, straight, mathematical streets of his native city, his busy fancy wandered through the blind alleys and huddled zig-zag sinuosities of London, and the signs of Lothbury and East-Cheap swung and creaked in his delighted ears. The air of his own country was too poor and thin to satisfy the pantings of youthful ambition; he gasped for British popularity,—he came, and found it. He was received, caressed, applauded, made giddy: the national politeness owed him some return, for he imitated, admired, deferred to us; and, if his notions were sometimes wrong, yet it was plain he thought of nothing else, and was ready to sacrifice every thing to obtain a smile or a look of approbation. It is true, he brought no new earth, no sprig of laurel gathered in the wilderness, no red bird's wing, no gleam from crystal lake or new-discovered fountain, (neither grace nor grandeur plucked from the bosom of this Eden-state like that which belongs to cradled infancy); but he brought us *rifaciméntos* of our own thoughts—copies of our favourite authors: we saw our self-admiration reflected in an accomplished stranger's eyes; and the lover received from his mistress, the British public, her most envied favours.

Mr Brown, who preceded him, and was the author of several novels which made some noise in this country, was a writer of a different stamp. Instead of hesitating before a scruple, and aspiring to avoid a fault, he braved criticism, and aimed only at effect. He was an inventor, but without materials. His strength and his efforts are convulsive throes—his works are a banquet of horrors. The hint of some of them is taken from Caleb Wil-

liams and St Leon, but infinitely exaggerated, and carried to disgust and outrage. They are full (to disease) of imagination,—but it is forced, violent, and shocking. This is to be expected, we apprehend, in attempts of this kind in a country like America, where there is, generally speaking, no *natural imagination*. The mind must be excited by overstraining, by pulleys and levers. Mr Brown was a man of genius, of strong passion, and active fancy; but his genius was not seconded by early habit, or by surrounding sympathy. His story and his interests are not wrought out, therefore, in the ordinary course of nature; but are, like the monster in Frankenstein, a man made by art and determined will. For instance, it may be said of him, as of Gawin Douglas, ‘Of Brownies and Bogilis full is his Buik.’ But no ghost, we will venture to say, was ever seen in North America. They do not walk in broad day; and the night of ignorance and superstition which favours their appearance, was long past before the United States lifted up their head beyond the Atlantic wave. The inspired poet’s tongue must have an echo in the state of public feeling, or of involuntary belief, or it soon grows harsh or mute. In America, they are ‘so well policed,’ so exempt from the knowledge of fraud or force, so free from the assaults of *the flesh and the devil*, that in pure hardness of belief they hoot the *Beggar’s Opera* from the stage: with them, poverty and crime, pickpockets and highwaymen, the lock-up-house and the gallows, are things incredible to sense! In this orderly and undramatic state of security and freedom from natural foes, Mr Brown has provided one of his heroes with a demon to torment him, and fixed him at his back;—but what is to keep him there? Not any prejudice or lurking superstition on the part of the American reader: for the lack of such, the writer is obliged to make up by incessant rodomontade, and face-making. The want of genuine imagination is always proved by caricature: monsters are the growth, not of passion, but of the attempt forcibly to stimulate it. In our own unrivalled Novelist, and the great exemplar of this kind of writing, we see how ease and strength are united. Tradition and invention meet half way; and nature scarce knows how to distinguish them. The reason is, there is here an old and solid ground in previous manners and opinion for imagination to rest upon. The air of this bleak northern clime is filled with legendary lore: Not a castle without the stain of blood upon its floor or winding steps: not a glen without its ambush or its feat of arms: not a lake without its Lady! But the map of America is not historical; and, therefore, works of fiction do not take root in it; for the fiction, to be good for any thing, must not be in the author’s mind, but



belong to the age or country in which he lives. The genius of America is essentially mechanical and modern.

Mr Cooper describes things to the life, but he puts no motion into them. While he is insisting on the minutest details, and explaining all the accompaniments of an incident, the story stands still. The elaborate accumulation of particulars serves not to embody his imagery, but to distract and impede the mind. He is not so much the master of his materials as their drudge : He labours under an epilepsy of the fancy. He thinks himself bound in his character of novelist to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Thus, if two men are struggling on the edge of a precipice for life or death, he goes not merely into the vicissitudes of action and passion as the chances of the combat vary ; but stops to take an inventory of the geography of the place, the shape of the rock, the precise attitude and display of the limbs and muscles, with the eye and habits of a sculptor. Mr Cooper does not seem to be aware of the infinite divisibility of mind and matter ; and that an 'abridgment' is all that is possible or desirable in the most individual representation. A person who is so determined, may write volumes on a grain of sand or an insect's wing. Why describe the dress and appearance of an Indian chief, down to his tobacco-stopper and button-holes ? It is mistaking the province of the artist for that of the historian ; and it is this very obligation of painting and statuary to fill up all the details, that renders them incapable of telling a story, or of expressing more than a single moment, group, or figure. Poetry or romance does not descend into the particulars, but atones for it by a more rapid march and an intuitive glance at the more striking results. By considering truth or matter-of-fact as the sole element of popular fiction, our author fails in massing and in impulse. In the midst of great vividness and fidelity of description, both of nature and manners, there is a sense of jejuneness,—for half of what is described is insignificant and indifferent ; there is a hard outline,—a little manner ; and his most striking situations do not tell as they might and ought, from his seeming more anxious about the mode and circumstances than the catastrophe. In short, he anatomizes his subjects ; and his characters bear the same relation to living beings that the botanic specimens collected in a portfolio do to the living plant or tree. The sap does not circulate kindly ; nor does the breath of heaven visit, or its dews moisten them. Or, if Mr Cooper gets hold of an appalling circumstance, he, from the same tenacity and thralldom to outward impressions, never lets it go : He repeats it without end. Thus, if he once hits upon the supposition of a wild Indian's eyes glaring

through a thicket, every bush is from that time forward furnished with a pair; the page is studded with them, and you can no longer look about you at ease or in safety. The high finishing we have spoken of is particularly at variance with the rudeness of the materials. In Richardson it was excusable, where all was studied and artificial; but a few dashes of red ochre are sufficient to paint the body of a savage chieftain; nor should his sudden and frantic stride on his prey be treated with the precision and punctiliousness of a piece of *still life*. There are other American writers, (such as the historiographer of *Brother Jonathan*,) who carry this love of veracity to a pitch of the marvellous. They run riot in an account of the dishes at a boarding-house, as if it were a banquet of the Gods; and recount the overturning of a travelling stage-waggon with as much impetuosity, turbulence, and exaggerated enthusiasm, as if it were the fall of Phaeton. In the absence of subjects of real interest, men make themselves an interest out of nothing, and magnify mole-hills into mountains. This is not the fault of Mr Cooper: He is always true, though sometimes tedious; and correct, at the expense of being insipid. His *Pilot* is the best of his works; and truth to say, we think it a master-piece in its kind. It has great unity of purpose and feeling. Every thing in it may be said

——‘To suffer a *sea-change*  
Into something new and strange.’

His *Pilot* never appears but when the occasion is worthy of him; and when he appears, the result is sure. The description of his guiding the vessel through the narrow strait left for her escape, the sea-fight, and the incident of the white topsail of the English man-of-war appearing above the fog, where it is first mistaken for a cloud, are of the first order of graphic composition; to say nothing of the admirable episode of Tom Coffin, and his long figure coiled up like a rope in the bottom of the boat. The rest is *common-place*; but then it is American *common-place*. We thank Mr Cooper he does not take every thing from us, and therefore we can learn something from him. He has the saving grace of originality. We wish we could impress it, ‘line upon line, and precept upon precept,’ especially upon our American brethren, how precious, how invaluable *that* is. In art, in literature, in science, the least bit of nature is worth all the plagiarism in the world. The great secret of Sir Walter Scott’s enviable, but unenvied success, lies in his transcribing from nature instead of transcribing from books.

Anterior to the writers above mentioned, were other three, who may be named as occupying (two of them at least) a higher and graver place in the yet scanty annals of American Literature. These were Franklin, the author (whoever he was) of the *American Farmer's Letters*, and Jonathan Edwards.

Franklin, the most celebrated, was emphatically an American. He was a great experimental philosopher, a consummate politician, and a paragon of common sense. His *Poor Robin* was an absolute manual for a country in leading-strings, making its first attempts to go alone. There is nowhere compressed in the same compass so great a fund of local information and political sagacity, as in his *Examination before the Privy Council* in the year 1754. The fine *Parable against Persecution*, which appears in his miscellaneous works, is borrowed from Bishop Taylor. Franklin is charged by some with a want of imagination, or with being a mere prosaic, practical man; but the instinct of the true and the useful in him, had more genius in it than all the 'metre-ballad-mongering' of those who take him to task.

The *American Farmer's Letters*, (published under a feigned name\* a little before the breaking out of the American war,) give us a tolerable idea how American scenery and manners may be treated with a lively, poetic interest. The pictures are sometimes highly-coloured, but they are vivid and strikingly characteristic. He gives not only the objects, but the feelings, of a new country. He describes himself as placing his little boy in a chair screwed to the plough which he guides, (to inhale the scent of the fresh furrows,) while his wife sits knitting under a tree at one end of the field. He recounts a battle between two snakes with an Homeric gravity and exuberance of style. He paints the dazzling, almost invisible flutter of the humming-bird's wing: Mr Moore's airiest verse is not more light and evanescent. His account of the manners of the Nantucket people, their frank simplicity, and festive rejoicings after the perils and hardships of the whale-fishing, is a true and heartfelt picture. There is no fastidious refinement or cynical contempt: He enters into their feelings and amusements with the same alacrity as they do themselves; and this is sure to awaken a fellow-feeling in the reader. If the author had been thinking of the effect of his description in a London drawing-room, or had insisted on the most disagreeable features in the mere littleness of national jealousy, he would have totally spoiled it. But health, joy, and innocence,

---

\* Hector St John.

are good things all over the world, and in all classes of society; and, to impart pleasure, need only be described in their genuine characters. The power to sympathize with nature, without thinking of ourselves or others, if it is not a definition of genius, comes very near to it. From this liberal unaffected style, the Americans are particularly cut off by habitual comparisons with us, or upstart claims of their own;—by the dread of being thought vulgar, which necessarily makes them so, or the determination to be fine, which must for ever prevent it. The most interesting part of the author's work is that where he describes the first indications of the breaking-out of the American war—the distant murmur of the tempest—the threatened inroad of the Indians like an inundation on the peaceful back-settlements: his complaints and his auguries are fearful. But we have said enough of this *Illustrious Obscure*; for it is the rule of criticism to praise none but the over-praised, and to offer fresh incense to the idol of the day.

It is coming more within canonical bounds, and approaching nearer the main subject of this notice, to pay a tribute to the worth and talents of Jonathan Edwards; the well-known author of the *Treatise on the Will*, who was a Massachusetts divine and most able logician. Having produced *him*, the Americans need not despair of their metaphysicians. We do not scruple to say, that he is one of the acutest, most powerful, and, of all reasoners, the most conscientious and sincere. His closeness and candour are alike admirable. Instead of puzzling or imposing on others, he tries to satisfy his own mind. We do not say whether he is right or wrong; we only say that his method is 'an honest method': there is not a trick, a subterfuge, a verbal sophism in his whole book. Those who compare his arguments with what Priestley or Hobbes have written on the same question, will find the one petulant and the other dogmatical. Far from taunting his adversaries, he endeavours with all his might to explain difficulties; and acknowledges that the words *Necessity*, *Irresistible*, *Inevitable*, &c., which are applied to external force, acting in spite of the will, are misnomers when applied to acts, or a necessity emanating from the will itself; and that the repugnance of his favourite doctrine to common sense and feeling, (in which most of his party exult as a triumph of superior wisdom over vulgar prejudice,) is an unfortunate stumbling-block in the way of truth, arising out of the structure of language itself. His anxiety to clear up the scruples of others, is equal, in short, to his firmness in maintaining his own opinion.

We could wish that Dr Channing had formed himself upon this manly and independent model, instead of going through the

circle of reigning topics, to strike an affected balance between ancient prejudice and modern paradox; to trim to all opinions, and unite all suffrages; to calculate the vulgar clamour, or the venal sophistry of the British press, for the meridian of Boston. Dr Channing is a great tactician in reasoning; and reasoning has nothing to do with tactics. We do not like to see a writer constantly trying to steal a march upon opinion without having his retreat cut off—full of pretensions, and void of offence. It is as bad as the opposite extreme of outraging decorum at every step; and is only a more covert mode of attracting attention, and gaining surreptitious applause. We never saw any thing more guarded in this respect than Dr Channing's *Tracts and Sermons*—more completely suspended between heaven and earth. He keeps an eye on both worlds; kisses hands to the reading public all round; and does his best to stand well with different sects and parties. He is always in advance of the line, in an amiable and imposing attitude, but never far from succour. He is an Unitarian; but then he disclaims all connexion with Dr Priestley, a samaterialist; he denounces Calvinism and the Church of England; but to show that this proceeds from no want of liberality, makes the *amende honorable* to Popery and Popish divines;—is an American Republican and a French Bourbonist—abuses Bonaparte, and observes a profound silence with respect to Ferdinand—likes wit, provided it is serious—and is zealous for the propagation of the Gospel and the honour of religion; but thinks it should form a coalition with reason, and be surrounded with a halo of modern lights. We cannot combine such a system of checks and saving clauses. We are dissatisfied with the want not only of originality of view, but of moral daring. And here we will state a suspicion, into which we have been led by more than one American writer, that the establishment of civil and religious liberty is not quite so favourable to the independent formation, and free circulation of opinion, as might be expected. Where there is a perfect toleration—where there is neither Censorship of the press nor Inquisition, the public take upon themselves the task of *surveillance*, and exercise the functions of a literary police, like so many familiars of the *Holy Office*. In a monarchy, or mixed government, there is an appeal open from the government to the people; there is a natural opposition, as it were, between prejudice, or authority, and reason: but when the community take the power into their own hands, and there is but one body of opinion, and one voice to express it, there can be no *reaction* against it; and to remonstrate or resist, is not only a public outrage, but sounds like a personal insult to every individual in the community. It is differing from the company;

you become a *black sheep in the flock*. There is no excuse or mercy for it. Hence the too frequent cowardice, jesuitism, and sterility, produced by this republican discipline and drilling. Opinions must march abreast—must keep in rank and file, and woe to the catiff thought that advances before the rest, or turns aside! This uniformity, and equal purpose on all sides, leads (if not checked) to a monstrous Ostracism in public opinion. Whoever outstrips, or takes a separate path to himself, is considered as usurping an unnatural superiority over the whole. He is treated not with respect or indulgence, but indignity.

We like Dr Channing's Sermons best; his Criticisms less; his Politics least of all. We think several of his Discourses do great honour to himself and his profession, and are highly respectable models of pulpit-composition. We would instance more particularly, and recommend to the perusal of our readers, that *On the Duties of Children*. The feeling, the justness of observation, the tenderness, and the severity, are deserving of all praise. The author here appears in a truly amiable and advantageous light. This composition alone makes us believe, that he is a good, and might, with proper direction and self-reliance, have been even a great man. We shall give a long extract with the more pleasure, as we are assuredly actuated by no ill-will towards the reverend author, and only wish to point out how very considerable ability, and probable uprightness of intention, may be warped and injured by a wrong bias, and a candidateship for false and contradictory honours.

‘*First*, You are required to view and treat your parents with respect. Your tender, inexperienced age requires that you think of yourselves with humility, and conduct yourselves with modesty; that you respect the superior age, and wisdom, and improvements of your parents, and observe towards them a submissive deportment. Nothing is more unbecoming you; nothing will render you more unpleasant in the eyes of others, than forward or contemptuous conduct towards your parents. There are children, and I wish I could say there are only a few, who speak to their parents with rudeness, grow sullen at their rebukes, behave in their presence as if they deserved no attention, hear them speak without noticing them, and rather ridicule than honour them. There are many children at the present day who think more highly of themselves than of their elders; who think that their own wishes are first to be gratified; who abuse the condescension and kindness of their parents, and treat them as servants rather than superiors. Beware, my young friends, lest you grow up with this assuming and selfish spirit. Regard your parents as kindly given you by God, to support, direct, and govern you in your present state of weakness and inexperience. Express your respect for them in your manner and conversation. Do not neglect those outward signs of dependence and inferiority which suit your age. You are young, and you should therefore take the lowest place, and rather retire than thrust yourselves forward into notice. You

have much to learn, and you should therefore hear, instead of seeking to be heard. You are dependent, and you should therefore ask instead of demanding what you desire, and you should receive every thing from your parents as a favour, and not as a debt. I do not mean to urge upon you a slavish fear of your parents. Love them, and love them ardently ; but mingle a sense of their superiority with your love. Feel a confidence in their kindness ; but let not this confidence make you rude and presumptuous, and lead to indecent familiarity. Talk to them with openness and freedom ; but never contradict with violence ; never answer with passion or contempt.

‘ *Secondly*, You should be grateful to your parents. Consider how much you owe them. The time has been, and it was not a long time past, when you depended wholly on their kindness,—when you had no strength to make a single effort for yourselves,—when you could neither speak nor walk, and knew not the use of any of your powers. Had not a parent’s arm supported you, you must have fallen to the earth, and perished. Observe with attention the infants which you often see, and consider that a little while ago you were as feeble as they are : you were only a burden and a care, and you had nothing with which you could repay your parents’ affection. But did they forsake you ? How many sleepless nights have they been disturbed by your cries ! When you were sick, how tenderly did they hang over you ! With what pleasure have they seen you grow up in health to your present state ; and what do you now possess which you have not received from their hands ? God, indeed, is your great parent, your best friend, and from him every good gift descends ; but God is pleased to bestow every thing upon you through the kindness of your parents. To your parents you owe every comfort : you owe to them the shelter you enjoy from the rain and cold, the raiment which covers, and the food which nourishes you. While you are seeking amusements, or are employed in gaining knowledge at school, your parents are toiling that you may be happy, that your wants may be supplied, that your minds may be improved, that you may grow up and be useful in the world. And when you consider how often you have forfeited all this kindness, and yet how ready they have been to forgive you, and to continue their favours, ought not you to look upon them with the tenderest gratitude ? What greater monster can there be than an unthankful child, whose heart is never warmed by the daily expressions of parental solicitude ; who, instead of requiting his best friend by his affectionate conduct, is sullen and passionate, and thinks his parents will do nothing for him, because they will not do all he desires ? Consider how much better they can decide for you than you can for yourselves. You know but little of the world in which you live. You hastily catch at every thing which promises you pleasure ; and unless the authority of a parent should restrain you, you would soon rush into ruin, without a thought or a fear. In pursuing your own inclinations, your health would be destroyed, your minds would run to waste, you would grow up slothful, selfish, a trouble to others, and burdensome to yourselves. Submit, then, cheerfully to your parents. Have you not experienced their goodness long enough to know, that they wish to make you happy, even when their commands are

most severe? **Prove**, then, your sense of this goodness by doing cheerfully what they require. When they oppose your wishes, do not think that you have more knowledge than they. Do not receive their commands with a sour, angry, sullen look, which says, louder than words, that you obey only because you dare not rebel. If they deny your requests, do not persist in urging them, but consider how many requests they have already granted you. Do not expect that your parents are to give up every thing to you, but study to give up every thing to them. Do not wait for them to threaten, but when a look tells you what they want, fly to perform it. This is the way in which you can best reward them for all their pains and labours. In this way you will make their house pleasant and cheerful. But if you are disobedient, perverse, and stubborn, you will make home a place of contention, noise, and anger, and your best friends will have reason to wish that you had never been born. A disobedient child almost always grows up ill-natured and disobliging to all with whom he is connected. None love him, and he has no heart to love any but himself. If you would be amiable in your temper and manner, and desire to be beloved, let me advise you to begin your life with giving up your wills to your parents.

‘Again, You must express your respect for your parents, by placing unreserved confidence in them. This is a very important part of your duty. Children should learn to be honest, sincere, open-hearted to their parents. An artful, hypocritical child is one of the most unpromising characters in the world. You should have no secrets which you are unwilling to disclose to your parents. If you have done wrong, you should openly confess it, and ask that forgiveness which a parent’s heart is so ready to bestow. If you wish to undertake any thing, ask their consent. Never begin any thing in the hope you can conceal your design. If you once strive to impose on your parents, you will be led on, from one step to another, to invent falsehoods, to practise artifice, till you will become contemptible and hateful. You will soon be detected, and then none will trust you. Sincerity in a child will make up for many faults. Of children, he is the worst who watches the eyes of his parents, pretends to obey as long as they see him, but as soon as they have turned away, does what they have forbidden. Whatever else you do, never deceive. Let your parents learn your faults from your own lips, and be assured they will never love you the less for your openness and sincerity.’—(*Sermons and Tracts*, p. 233.)

The whole discourse is prettily turned, and made out with great simplicity and feeling. There is a want neither of heart nor head. Dr Channing here does well, for he trusts to his own observations and convictions. We may also give what he says in answer to Fenelon, on the subject of *self-annihilation*, as another favourable specimen of free enquiry, and of a higher or more philosophical cast.

‘We have said that self-crucifixion and love to God are, in Fenelon’s system, the two chief constituents, or elements, of virtue and perfection. To these we will give separate attention, although in truth, they often



coalesce, and always imply one another. We begin with self-crucifixion, or what is often called self-sacrifice, and on this we chiefly differ from the expositions of our author. Perhaps the word *self*, occurs more frequently than any other in Fenelon's writings, and he is particularly inclined to place it in contrast with, and in opposition to, God. According to his common teaching, God and self are hostile influences or attractions, having nothing in common; the one the concentration of all evil, the other of all good. Self is the principle and the seat of all guilt and misery. He is never weary of pouring reproach on self; and, generally speaking, sets no limits to the duty of putting it to a painful death. Now, language like this has led men to very injurious modes of regarding themselves and their own nature, and made them forgetful of what they owe to themselves. It has thrown a cloud over man's condition and prospects. It has led to self-contempt, a vice as pernicious as pride. A man, when told perpetually to crucify *himself*, is apt to include under this word his whole nature; and we fear that, under this teaching, our nature is repressed, its growth stunted, its free movements chained, and, of course, its beauty, grace, and power impaired. We mean not to charge on Fenelon this error of which we have spoken, or to hold him responsible for its effects. But we do think that it finds shelter under his phraseology; and we deem it so great, so pernicious, as to need a faithful exposition. Men err in nothing more than in disparaging and wronging their own nature. None are just to themselves. The truth on this great subject is indeed so obscured, that it may startle as a paradox. A human being, justly viewed, instead of being bound to general self-crucifixion, cannot reverence and cherish himself too much. This position, we know, is strong; but strong language is needed to encounter strong delusion. We would teach that great limitations must be set to the duty of renouncing or denying ourselves, and that no self-crucifixion is virtuous but that which concurs with, and promotes self-respect. We will unfold our meaning, beginning with positions which we presume will be controverted by none.

Dr Channing, after showing that the mind, the body, and even self-love, are parts of our nature which cannot well be dispensed with, thus proceeds:—

‘Now, it is not true that self-love is our only principle, or that it constitutes ourselves any more than other principles; and the wrong done to our nature by such modes of speech, needs to be resisted. Our nature has other elements or constituents, and vastly higher ones, to which self-love was meant to minister, and which are at war with its excesses. For example, we have reason or intellectual energy given us for the pursuit and acquisition of truth; and this is essentially a disinterested principle, for truth, which is its object, is of a universal, impartial nature. The great province of the intellectual faculty is to acquaint the individual with the laws and order of the divine system; a system, which spreads infinitely beyond himself, and of which he forms a small part; which embraces innumerable beings equally favoured by God, and which proposes, as its sublime and beneficent end, the ever-growing good of the whole. Again, human nature has a variety of affections, corresponding to our domestic

and most common relations; affections, which in multitudes overpower self-love, which make others the chief object of our care, which nerve the arm for ever-recurring toil by day, and strengthen the wearied frame to forego the slumbers of the night. Then there belongs to every man the general sentiment of humanity, which responds to all human sufferings—to a stranger's tears and groans, and often prompts to great sacrifices for his relief. Above all, there is the moral principle, that which should especially be called a man's self; for it is clothed with a kingly authority over his whole nature, and was plainly given to bear sway over every desire. This is evidently a disinterested principle. Its very essence is impartiality. It has no respect of persons. It is the principle of justice, taking the rights of all under its protection, and frowning on the least wrong, however largely it may serve ourselves. This moral nature especially delights in, and enjoins a universal charity, and makes the heart thrill with exulting joy, at the sight or hearing of magnanimous deeds, of perils fronted, or death endured in the cause of humanity. Now, these various principles, and especially the last, are as truly ourselves as self-love. When a man thinks of himself, these ought to occur to him as his chief attributes. He can hardly injure himself more than by excluding these from his conception of himself, and by making self-love the great constituent of his nature.

‘We have urged these remarks on the narrow sense often given to the word *self*, because we are persuaded that it leads to degrading ideas of human nature, and to the pernicious notion that we practise a virtuous self-sacrifice in holding it in contempt. We would have it understood, that high faculties form this despised self, as truly as low desires; and we would add, that when these are faithfully unfolded, this self takes rank among the noblest beings in the universe. To illustrate this thought, we ask the reader's attention to an important, but much-neglected, view of virtue and religion. These are commonly spoken of in an abstract manner, as if they were distinct from ourselves—as if they were foreign existences, which enter the human mind, and dwell there in a kind of separation from itself. Now, religion and virtue, wherever they exist, are the mind itself, and nothing else. A good man's piety and virtue are not distinct possessions; they are himself, and all the glory which belongs to them, belongs to himself. What is religion? Not a foreign inhabitant—not something alien to our nature, which comes and takes up its abode in the soul. It is the soul itself, lifting itself up to its Maker. What is virtue? It is the soul listening to, and revering and obeying a law which belongs to its very essence—the law of duty. We sometimes smile when we hear men decrying human nature, and in the same breath extolling religion to the skies, as if religion were any thing more than human nature acting in obedience to its chief law. Religion and virtue, as far as we possess them, are ourselves; and the homage which is paid to these attributes, is in truth a tribute to the soul of man. Self-crucifixion, then, should it exclude self-reverence, would be any thing but virtue.

‘We would briefly suggest another train of thought leading to the same result. Self-crucifixion, or self-renunciation, is a work, and work requires an agent. By whom, then, is it accomplished? We answer, by the man

himself, who is the subject of it. It is he who is summoned to the effort. He is called by a voice within, and by the law of God, to put forth power over himself, to rule his own spirit, to subdue every passion. Now, this inward power, which self-crucifixion supposes and demands, is the most signal proof of a high nature which can be given. It is the most illustrious power which God confers. It is a sovereignty worth more than that over outward nature. It is the chief constituent of the noblest order of virtues; and its greatness, of course, demonstrates the greatness of the human mind, which is perpetually bound and summoned to put it forth. But this is not all; self-crucifixion has an object, an end. And what is it? Its great end is to give liberty and energy to our nature. Its aim is not to break down the soul, but to curb those lusts and passions which "war against the soul," that the moral and intellectual faculties may rise into new life, and may manifest their divine original. Self-crucifixion, justly viewed, is the suppression of the passions, that the power and progress of thought, and conscience, and pure love, may be unrestrained. It is the destruction of the brute, that the angel may unfold itself within. It is founded on our godlike capacities, and the expansion and glory of these is the end. Thus the very duty, which by some is identified with self-contempt, implies and imposes self-reverence. It is the belief and the choice of perfection, as our inheritance and our end.'

This is extremely well meant, and very ably executed. There is a *primâ philosophiâ* view of the subject, which is, we think, above the ordinary level of polemical reasoning in our own country. In the line of argument adopted by our author, there is a strong reflection of the original and masterly views of the innate capacity of the soul for piety and goodness, insisted on in Bishop Butler's *Sermons*—a work which has fallen into neglect, partly because of the harshness and obscurity of its style, but more because it contains neither a libel on human nature, nor a burlesque upon religion. There is much in the above train of thought silently borrowed from this profound work. Dr Channing's argument is, we think, good and sound against the misanthropes in philosophy, and the cynics in religion, who alike maintain the absolute falsity of all human virtue; but the Bishop of Cambray might say, that, with respect to him, it was not a practical answer, so much as a verbal evasion; neither meeting his views nor removing the source of his complaints. Fenelon assuredly, in wishing to annihilate self, did not wish to extirpate charity and faith, but to crush the old serpent, the great enemy of these. There is no doubt of the capacity of the soul for good and evil; the only question is, which principle prevails and triumphs. The satirist and the man of the world laugh at the pretension to superior sanctity and disinterestedness; the pious enthusiast may then be excused if he weeps at the want of them.

How far does that likeness to God, and sympathy with the whole human race, which Fenelon deprecates the want of, and Dr Channing boasts of, as the inseparable attribute and chief ornament of man, really take place or not in the present state of things, and as a preparation for another and infinitely more important one? If we regard the moral capacity of man, *self* is a unit that counts millions. Its essence and its glory, says our optimist, is to comprehend the whole human race in its benevolent regards. Does it do so? The understanding runs along the whole chain of being; the affections stop, for the most part, at the first link in the chain. Sense, appetite, pride, passion, engross the whole of this self, and leave it nearly indifferent, if not averse, to all other claims on its attention. In order that the moral attainments should keep pace with the vaunted capacity of man, knowledge should be identified with feeling. We know that there are a million of other beings of as much worth, of the same nature, made in the image of God like ourselves. Have we the same sympathy with every one of these? Do we feel a million times more for all of them put together, than for ourselves? The least pain in our little finger gives us more concern and uneasiness, than the destruction of millions of our fellow-beings. Fenelon laments bitterly and feelingly this disparity between duty and inclination, this want of charity, and eating of self into the soul. What is the consequence of the disproportionate ratios in which the head and the heart move? This paltry *self*, looking upon itself as of more importance than all the rest of the world, fancies itself the centre of the universe, and would have every one look upon it in the same light. Not being able to sympathize with others as it ought, it hates and envies them; is mad to think of its own insignificance in the general system; cannot bear a rival or a superior; despises and tramples on inferiors, and would crush and annihilate all pretensions but its own, that it might be *all in all*. The worm puts on the monarch, or the god, in thought and in secret; and it is only when it can do so in fact, and in public, and be the tyrant or idol of its fellows, that it is at ease or satisfied with itself. Fenelon was right in crying out (if it could have done any good) for the crucifying of this importunate self, and putting a better principle in its stead.

Dr Channing's Essays on Milton and Bonaparte are both done upon the same false principle, of making out a case *for* or *against*. The one is full of common-place eulogy, the other of common-place invective. They are pulpit-criticisms. An orator who is confined to expound the same texts and doctrines week after week, slides very naturally and laudably into a habit

of monotony and paraphrase; is not allowed to be 'wise above what is written;' is grave from respect to his subject, and the authority attached to the truths he interprets; and if his style is tedious or his arguments trite, he is in no danger of being interrupted or taken to task by his audience. Such a person is unavoidably an advocate for certain received principles; often a dull one. He carries the professional license and character out of the pulpit into other things, and still fancies that he speaks 'with authority, and not as the scribes.' He may be prolix without suspecting it; may lay a solemn stress on the merest trifles; repeat truisms, and apologize for them as startling discoveries; may play the sophist, and conceive he is performing a sacred duty; and give what turn or gloss he pleases to any subject,—forgetting that the circumstances under which he declares himself, and the audience which he addresses, are entirely changed. If, as we readily allow, there are instances of preachers who have emancipated themselves from these professional habits, we can hardly add Dr Channing to the number.

His notice of Milton is elaborate and stately, but neither new nor discriminating. One of the first and most prominent passages is a defence of poetry:—

'Milton's fame rests chiefly on his poetry; and to this we naturally give our first attention. By those who are accustomed to speak of poetry as light reading, Milton's eminence in this sphere may be considered only as giving him a high rank among the contributors to public amusement. Not so thought Milton. Of all God's gifts of intellect, he esteemed poetical genius the most transcendent. He esteemed it in himself as a kind of inspiration, and wrote his great works with something of the conscious dignity of a prophet. We agree with Milton in his estimate of poetry. It seems to us the divinest of all arts; for it is the breathing or expression of that sentiment which is deepest and sublimest in human nature; we mean, of that thirst or aspiration, to which no mind is wholly a stranger, after something purer and lovelier, something more powerful, lofty, and thrilling, than ordinary and real life affords. No doctrine is more common among Christians than that of man's immortality; but it is not so generally understood, that the germs or principles of his whole future being are *now* wrapped up in his soul, as the rudiments of the future plant in the seed. As a necessary result of this constitution, the soul, possessed and moved by these mighty though infant energies, is perpetually stretching beyond what is present and visible, struggling against the bounds of its earthly prison-house, and seeking relief and joy in imaginings of un-*seen* and ideal being. This view of our nature, which has never been fully developed, and which goes farther towards explaining the contradictions of human life than all others, carries us to the very foundation and sources of poetry. He who cannot interpret by his own consciousness what we have now said, wants the true key

to works of genius. He has not penetrated those sacred recesses of the soul, where poetry is born and nourished, and inhales immortal vigour, and wings herself for her heavenward flight. In an intellectual nature, framed for progress and for higher modes of being, there must be creative energies, powers of original and ever-growing thought; and poetry is the form in which these energies are chiefly manifested. It is the glorious prerogative of this art, that it "makes all things new" for the gratification of a divine instinct. It indeed finds its elements in what it actually sees and experiences, in the worlds of matter and mind; but it combines and blends these into new forms and according to new affinities; breaks down, if we may so say, the distinctions and bounds of nature; imparts to material objects life, and sentiment, and emotion, and invests the mind with the powers and splendours of the outward creation; describes the surrounding universe in the colours which the passions throw over it, and depicts the mind in those moods of repose or agitation, of tenderness or sublime emotion, which manifest its thirst for a more powerful and joyful existence. To a man of a literal and prosaic character, the mind may seem lawless in these workings; but it observes higher laws than it transgresses, the laws of the immortal intellect; it is trying and developing its best faculties; and in the objects which it describes, or in the emotions which it awakens, anticipates those states of progressive power, splendour, beauty, and happiness, for which it was created.'

There is much more to the same purpose: The whole, to speak freely, is a laboured and somewhat tumid paraphrase on Lord Bacon's definition of poetry, (which has been often paraphrased before,) where he prefers it to history, 'as having something divine in it, and representing characters and objects not as they are, but as they ought to be.' This is the general feature of our author's writings; they cannot be called mere common-place, but they may be fairly termed *ambitious* common-place: That is, he takes up the newest and most plausible opinion at the turn of the tide, or just as it is getting into vogue, and would fain arrogate both the singularity and the popularity of it to himself. He hits the public between what they are tired of hearing, and what they never heard before. He has here, however, put the seal of orthodoxy on poetry, and we are not desirous to take it off. If he is inclined to stand sponsor to the Muses, and confirm their offspring at the Fount, he is welcome to do so. It is curious to see strict Professors for a long time denouncing and excommunicating Poetry as a wanton, and then, when they can no longer help it, clasping hands with her as the hand-maid of truth; and instead of making her the daughter of 'the father of lies,' identifying her with the vital spirit of religion and our happiest prospects.

Dr Channing is aware, however, that poetry is sometimes liable to abuse, and has given a handle to the ungodly; and as a set-off

and salvo to this objection, has a fling at Lord Byron, as the demon who scatters 'poison and death;' while Sir Walter Scott is the beneficent genius of poetry, unfolding and imparting new energies and the most delightful impulses to the human breast. In pronouncing the latter sentence, he bows to popular opinion; in the former, he considers just as properly what he owes to his profession.

The bulk of the account of Milton, both as a poet and a prose-writer, is, we are constrained to say, mere imitation or amplification of what has been said by others. He observes, *ex cathedra*, and with due gravity, that the *forte* of Milton is sublimity—that the two first books of *Paradise Lost* are unrivalled examples of that quality. He then proceeds to show, that he is not without tenderness or beauty, though he has not the graphic minuteness of Cowper or of Crabbe; he next praises his versification in opposition to the critics—dwells on the freshness and innocence of the picture of Adam and Eve in Paradise—maintains that our sympathy with Satan is nothing but the admiration of moral strength of mind—acknowledges the harshness and virulence of Milton's controversial writings, but blames Dr Johnson for doing so. All this we have heard or said before. We are not edified at all, nor are we greatly flattered by it. It is as if we should convey a letter to a friend in America, and should find it transcribed and sent back to us with a heavy postage.

We do not, then, set much store by our author's criticisms, because they sometimes seem to be, in a great measure, borrowed from our own lucubrations. We set still less store by his politics, for they are borrowed from others. We have no objection to the most severe or caustic probing of the character of the late ruler of France; but we *do* object, in the name both of history and philosophy, to misrepresentations and falsehoods, as the groundwork of such remarks. When England has exploded them, half in shame, and half in anger, the harpy echo lingers in America. The ugly mask has been taken off; but Dr Channing chooses to lecture on the mask in preference to the head. It would serve no useful purpose, however, to follow him in the details of his *Analysis of the Character of Bonaparte*. But we shall extract one of his most elaborate passages, in which he favours us with his opinion of the victors at Waterloo and Trafalgar:—

'The conqueror of Napoleon, the hero of Waterloo, undoubtedly possesses great military talents; but we have never heard of his eloquence in the senate, or of his sagacity in the cabinet; and we venture to say, that he will leave the world without adding one new thought on the great themes, on which the genius of philosophy and legislature has meditated for ages. We will not go down for illustration to such men as Nelson, a man great on the deck, but debased by gross vices, and who

never pretended to enlargement of intellect. To institute a comparison, in point of talent and genius, between such men and Milton, Bacon, and Shakspeare, is almost an insult to these illustrious names. Who can think of these truly great intelligences; of the range of their minds through heaven and earth; of their deep intuition into the soul; of their new and glowing combinations of thought; of the energy with which they grasped and subjected to their main purpose the infinite materials of illustration which nature and life afford; who can think of the forms of transcendent beauty and grandeur which they created, or which were rather emanations of their own minds; of the calm wisdom, and fervid, impetuous imagination which they conjoined; of the dominion which they have exercised over so many generations, and which time only extends and makes sure; of the voice of power, in which, though dead, they still speak to nations, and awaken intellect, sensibility, and genius, in both hemispheres;—who can think of such men, and not feel the immense inferiority of the most gifted warriors, whose elements of thought are physical forces and physical obstructions, and whose employment is the combination of the lowest class of objects on which a powerful mind can be employed?

We are here forcibly reminded of Fielding's character of Mr Abraham Adams. 'Indeed, if this good man had an enthusiasm, or what the vulgar call a blind side, it was this: he thought a Schoolmaster the greatest character in the world, and himself the greatest of all schoolmasters, neither of which points he would have given up to Alexander the Great at the head of his army.' So Dr Channing very gravely divides greatness into different sorts, and places himself at the top among those who *talk* about things—commanders at the bottom among those who only *do* them. He finds fault with Bonaparte for not coming up to his standard of greatness; but in order that he may not, raises this standard too high for humanity. To put it in force would be to leave the ancient and modern world as bare of great names as the wilds of North America. To make common sense of it, any one great man must be all the others. Homer only sung of battles, and it was honour enough for Alexander to place his works in a golden cabinet. Dr Channing allows Bonaparte's supremacy in war; but disputes it in policy. How many persons, from the beginning of the world, have united the two in a greater degree, or wielded more power in consequence? If Bonaparte had not gained a single battle, or planned a single successful campaign; if he had not scattered Coalition after Coalition, but invited the Allies to march to Paris; if he had not quelled the factions, but left them to cut one another's throats and his own; if he had not ventured on the *Concordat*, or framed a Code of Laws for France; if he had encouraged no art or science or man of genius; if he had not humbled the pride of 'ancient thrones,' and risen from the ground of the people to an equal height with



the Gods of the earth,—showing that the art and the right to reign is not confined to a particular race ; if he had been any thing but what he was, and had done nothing, he would then have come up to Dr Channing's notions of greatness, and to his boasted standard of a hero ! We in Europe, whether friends or foes, require something beyond this negative merit: we think that Cæsar, Alexander, and Charlemagne, were 'no babies;' we think that to move the great masses of power and bind opinions in a spell, is as difficult as the turning a period or winding up a homily ; and we are surprised that stanch republicans, who complain that the world bow to birth and rank alone, should turn with redoubled rage against intellect, the instant it became a match for pride and prejudice, and was the only thing that could be opposed to them with success, or could extort a moment's fear or awe for human genius or human nature.

Dr Channing's style is good, though in general too laboured, formal, and sustained. All is brought equally forward,—nothing is left to tell for itself. In the attempt to be copious, he is tautological ; in striving to explain every thing, he overloads and obscures his meaning. The fault is the uniform desire to produce an effect, and the supposition that this is to be done by main force.

In one sermon, Dr Channing insists boldly and loudly on the necessity that American preachers should assume a loftier style, and put forth energies and pretensions to claim attention in proportion to the excited tone of public feeling, and the advances of modern literature and science. He reproaches them with their lukewarmness, and points out to them, as models, the novels of Scott and the poetry of Byron. If Dr Channing expects a grave preacher in a pulpit to excite the same interest as a tragedy hero on the stage, or a discourse on the meaning of a text of Scripture to enchain the feelings like one of the Waverley Novels, it will be a long time first. The mere proposal is *putting the will for the deed*, and an instance of that republican assurance and rejection of the idea of not being equal to any person or thing, which convinces pretenders of this stamp that there is no reason why they should not do all that others can, and a great deal more into the bargain.

- ART. VIII.—1. *L'agent immédiat du mouvement vital dévoilé, dans sa nature et dans son mode d'action chez les Végétaux*, &c. Par M. H. DUTROCHET. 8vo. Paris, 1826.
2. *Organographie Végétale, ou Description Raisonnée des Organes des Plantes*. Par M. AUG. PYR. DE CANDOLLE. 8vo. Tom. 2. A Paris, 1827.
3. *Conversations on Vegetable Physiology, comprehending the Elements of Botany, with their Application to Agriculture*. By the Author of "Conversations on Chemistry," &c. &c. 2 vols. 12mo. Lond. 1829.

**I**N the year 1813, M. De Candolle exhibited, in his *Théorie Élémentaire de la Botanique*, a comprehensive outline of the principles which should regulate the classification of plants, and the art of describing and studying them. In its ordinary acceptation, the science of Botany embraces, 1st, A knowledge of the terms employed to designate the parts or organs of plants, usually denominated Terminology—Glossology by M. De Candolle; 2dly, Their systematic arrangement or classification, which he names Taxonomy; and 3dly, The art of describing them in such a manner, that all the species of which the vegetable kingdom is composed may be distinguished and recognised, termed by him Phytography.

Much as this embraces, it presents only a very limited view of the science of Botany. Vegetables ought also to be studied as organized and living beings. This study bears the name of Vegetable Physics, or Organic Botany; and comprehends, 1st, The study of the structure of the organs of plants, termed Anatomy or Organography; 2dly, The study of the functions of these organs in their state of health, or Physiology; 3dly, An examination of the derangements to which the functions are exposed, or Vegetable Pathology; and 4thly, An enquiry into the physical causes which, modified by the particular nature of plants, determine their place or *habitat* on the surface of the globe, named Botanical Geography.

To these *two* parts, which truly constitute all the theory of the science, we must add a *third*, viz. the study of the relations subsisting between vegetables and the human race, or *Botanique Appliquée*, as exemplified in the applications we make of our knowledge of plants to Agriculture, to Medicine, to Domestic Economy, and the Arts. All these parts of the science, says our author, have among them numerous and necessary relations;

and nothing is so adverse to the progress of any one branch as to isolate it from all the others. It would be easy to prove that the separation, which has so long existed between those who cultivate Botany, properly so called, and Vegetable Physics, is one of the causes which has retarded the progress of both departments; for it is impossible to expound with advantage the principles of any one part of Botany, without presuming, from time to time, some general knowledge of the others.

In the elementary treatise just referred to, M. De Candolle exhibited at large the principles of nomenclature and of classification, both natural and artificial; as well as those which should regulate Descriptive Botany. This latter department he has since prosecuted in detail, in a work of vast research and labour, under the title of *Systema Universale Regni Vegetabilis*, of which two volumes have been published. But the immense number of known plants, extending to more than 50,000, and every day rapidly increasing, puts it quite beyond the power of any individual to complete so great an undertaking within a moderate period of time. At the request, therefore, of several eminent Botanists, who wished immediately to possess a shorter systematic work, M. De Candolle has suspended his former more extensive undertaking, and limited himself for the present to the task, in itself sufficiently laborious, of exhibiting a synoptical view of Descriptive Botany in its present state; in which he proposes to enumerate and describe, shortly, the orders, genera, and species of all the plants hitherto known, arranged according to the natural method of classification.\* This work he hopes may serve as a guide, or, at least, an index to Botanists, who often, at present, wander in doubt among the numerous books produced within these few years; and he proposes, when it shall be finished, to resume the System before mentioned. Pursuing, at the same time, the department of Vegetable Physics, he has exhibited, in the work before us, his views of the structure of plants, and expresses a hope of being able to publish gradually the different parts which compose the Course of Botany, delivered annually by him for the last twenty years. These parts, we presume, will comprise the Physiology, Pathology, and Geographical Distribution of Plants, together

---

\* This work is entitled, 'Prodromus Systematis Naturalis Regni Vegetabilis, sive Enumeratio Contracta Ordinum Generum Specierumque Plantarum huc usque cognitarum, juxta methodi naturalis normas digesta.'

with the various applications of all this acquired knowledge to the purposes and uses of man.

Nearly connected with the work of M. De Candolle, are the instructive little volumes, entitled *Conversations on Vegetable Physiology*. They are composed by an author (Mrs Marcet) already well known by similar works on other branches of science; all of which have been received with great and merited favour. As the subject of her present undertaking is, at least in interest, equal to those which have preceded it, and her method of treating it as pleasing and popular, we can have little doubt that it will meet with corresponding success. The author modestly states, that her knowledge of the subject has been almost entirely, and very recently, derived from attendance on the lectures of M. De Candolle. From those lectures, the facts and opinions contained in her pages are almost exclusively taken; and to him she makes an acknowledgment of her obligations for the encouragement and assistance rendered in the execution of her task; claiming for herself nothing more than the merit of arranging the subject in that form, which appeared to her best suited to arrest the attention of those for whom her work was designed. From this work, therefore, we may, to a certain extent, learn the opinions of the distinguished Professor on some points of importance, earlier than we could otherwise have expected; and catch a glimpse of his views on the physiology, as well as on the structure, of plants.

In works embracing so great a variety of subjects we can only touch on a few of the more prominent points; and shall chiefly confine our remarks to what relates to the general structure of plants, and the movements of the vegetable fluids. These are the first and most important points in vegetable physiology; since, without some distinct knowledge of them, it is impossible to move a step in our enquiries into the other functions. They are besides subjects of doubt and dispute at the present moment; and our account of them, brief as it must necessarily be, will consequently involve many of the leading questions concerning which physiologists continue to differ.

The *Organography* of M. De Candolle, as its title imports, is almost entirely anatomical. The author, in treating his subject, has freely and fairly canvassed the opinions of various writers who have preceded him, and has frequently formed his own views of their merits from observations made by himself. A spirit of philosophical candour breathes through the entire work, and a laudable disposition to adhere to the results of observation and experiment is everywhere manifest; though it is much to be regretted,

that, in the subject we have now to treat of, even these but too often lead us astray. The *Conversations on Vegetable Physiology*, again, are designed entirely for popular use, though often exhibiting concise but lucid views of the abstruser parts of the science. The more technical parts of the subject are but slightly handled, yet sufficiently to afford correct general notions of its various objects and bearings. With the physiological discussions, familiar illustrations, drawn from natural appearances, or the arts more particularly connected with the vegetable kingdom, are commonly blended; and these arts, again, derive new interest and importance from the elucidations they thus receive from the application of scientific principles. In this manner, in the course of the work, the leading practices of agriculture and gardening are brought forward and explained on the principles of vegetable physiology. It is this feature that marks the peculiar character of the work; and renders it far more pleasing and instructive than ordinary books on Botany, which commonly exhibit more of the technicalities than utilities of the science.

In the study of Physiology, the only foundation on which we can securely build is Anatomy. Unless the structure of an organ be known, we can have no correct notion of its functions. Even with this knowledge, the functions may still remain unknown, but we shall at least be saved from the error of ascribing to an organ actions which its mechanism forbids it to exercise. After all that has been done to elucidate the anatomy of plants, it must be confessed that their elementary structure is still so imperfectly known, that scarcely any two writers are agreed upon it. Except in some of the lowest tribes of vegetables, however, all writers agree so far with Grew and Malpighi as to consider all plants to be essentially composed of two elementary systems or tissues, denominated, from their appearance, the cellular and vascular tissues: But when they proceed to deliver their opinions concerning the structure of the vessels and cells, they are all at variance with each other. This discordance arises partly from the extreme delicacy and minuteness of the objects, and partly from errors in observation, when highly magnifying powers are employed. Thus, in looking at a portion of cellular tissue, one person sees, or imagines he sees, distinct apertures or pores in the sides of every cell, by which a general communication is established through the whole; another regards these alleged pores as mere dots or specks, impressed on the surface of the cell, but not penetrating its substance; and a third denies altogether the existence of pores, and regards each

cell as a close cavity, having no visible communication with any other cell. The earlier observers, as Hooke, Grew, and Malpighi, supported this last view. Hooke, in particular, examined the cellular tissue of various plants by different methods, with the very purpose of discovering whether any direct communication existed betwixt the cells; but 'each cell,' says he, 'is distinctly separate from the rest, without any kind of hole in the encompassing films.' In opposition to a recent writer, M. Mirbel, who maintained the porosity of the cells, several German authors have lately re-examined the question, particularly M. Kieser; who declares that, after observations made with the greatest care, he has never been able to discover the slightest trace of pores in the sides of the cells.

Not less numerous and contradictory are the opinions still entertained concerning the kinds of vessels, and the uses they serve in plants. The older anatomists distinguish *two* kinds of vessels in the woody part of trees, and *one* in the bark. Of the former, those called lymph, or sap-vessels, by Grew, were regarded as simple tubes; whilst another order he named air-vessels, from their being generally found empty. These latter vessels, from their supposed office of conveying air, Malpighi named *tracheæ*, which appellation they still retain. Others, however, with more propriety, call them *spiral* vessels; a term that denotes merely their peculiar structure, and involves no opinion as to their use. Instead of two kinds, Mirbel enumerates not less than five species of vessels in the wood, all exhibiting distinct external characters, though he admits that they all sometimes occur together in the same vessel; whilst Kieser maintains, and, as we think, successfully, that these alleged *species* are only *varieties* of one common kind, which, in the progressive growth of the plant, successively assume the different characters they exhibit; or, in the language of Grew, are '*post-nate*, and seem produced by 'some alteration in the quality, position, and texture of their fibres.'

As to the structure of the vessels, the older anatomists considered them as entire tubes, without any pores or apertures in their sides. Malpighi, however, has described small tumors on the sides of certain vessels. Similar appearances were regarded as pores, first by Hill, and after him by Mirbel; and through these pores the fluids were considered to pass into the contiguous cells. Other observers have deemed these alleged pores to be elevations on the surface, or vesicles attached to the sides of the vessels, or globules contained within them. Kieser seems to doubt whether the small dots observed by him on these vessels

are mere specks on the surface, or real apertures, but inclines most to the former opinion. M. Dutrochet regards them as corpuscles, containing a nervous substance: and M. De Candelolle looks upon them as small glands, exercising an office in some way subservient to nutrition. So true is the observation of Hooke, that, 'of such minute objects, there is much 'more difficulty to discover the true shape by an instrument, 'than of those visible to the naked eye; the same object quite differing, in one position to the light, from what it really is, and 'may be discovered to be, in another:'—'for in some objects,' he adds, 'it is exceedingly difficult to distinguish between a 'prominency and a depression; between a shadow and a black 'stain; or a reflection and a whiteness in the colour.' On the whole, how much soever opinions differ as to the real nature of the objects, a great majority of observers are decidedly against the existence of pores in the vessels of plants.

Granting, then, that the cells are close cavities, having no apertures in their sides, and that the sides of the vessels are equally destitute of pores,—how shall we account for that communication betwixt the vessels and the cells, which the phenomena of vegetation continually exhibit? In the cotyledons of the seed, for example, matter is, at one period, deposited by the vessels in the cells, and at another, is removed and conveyed away to nourish the embryo; just as in animals the fat is deposited in a corresponding series of cells, and is afterwards absorbed by vessels for a similar purpose of nutrition. In the animal system, this alternate deposition and removal of fat is performed by the successive agency of secreting and absorbing vessels; and, in our opinion, the removal of albumen from the cells of the cotyledons, and its application to augment the growth of the vegetable embryo, equally implies the agency of secreting and absorbing structures. No one who examines the dissection of the bean, as delineated by Grew, can doubt that the communication between the embryo and the cotyledons is maintained by the medium of vessels; and if he follows the ramifications of these vessels through the entire mass of cells, as delineated by the same author, he can hardly refuse to admit, that it is by this vascular structure that secretion and absorption are there performed. As far as microscopical observations can be trusted, there are not wanting facts to prove a similar vascular communication between the vessels and cells of the mature plant. Thus Malpighi describes the cells of some plants as surrounded with a net-work of vessels: and the cells of elder, he adds, are furnished with numerous vessels, which spring probably from the

contiguous perpendicular vessels. In fleshy fruits, Du Hamel describes the vessels of the cellular tissue to be so numerous, that they seem to form the cells themselves: and it was the opinion of the elder De Saussure, that what is called the cellular part of the leaf, is formed entirely of minute transparent vessels, which, between their junctions, swell out so as to give the appearance of cells, though they are in reality a net-work of vessels. These appearances of minute vessels on the cells of the plant, not only prove the vascularity of those organs, but may be deemed the immediate means of communication betwixt them and the larger vessels. On the coat of certain vessels, also, Leuwenhoeck describes many minute processes, which he considered as excessively small vessels. These probably communicated directly with the contiguous cells; and perhaps the dots, observed on the sides of the vessels by Kieser and others, may be regarded as the torn and separated ends of that most minute vascular structure, which seems everywhere to connect the vascular and cellular tissues.

The elementary tissues, described above, enter, in very different proportions, into the construction of different plants, and are very variously blended together. Some of the lowest tribes of plants consist entirely of cellular tissue; at least no vessels have hitherto been demonstrated in them. In herbs, too, cellular tissue chiefly abounds, and the vessels are distributed through it sometimes in distinct fasciculi, sometimes in rays, and sometimes in circles; but always arranged, more or less perfectly, in a symmetrical order. In ordinary trees, again, the vessels greatly predominate, and their distribution through the cellular tissue is so regular, that the bark, wood, and pith are readily distinguished from each other. But symmetrical as the disposition of these several parts is in ordinary trees, 'there are other plants,' says Grew, 'in which there is neither bark nor pith; the vessels being dispersed and mixed with the parenchyme: (cellular tissue) 'from the circumference to the centre of the stalk,'—as in maize, sugar-cane, and some other plants. A similar structure is described by Malpighi as existing in ferns and in palms, &c. This difference in the disposition of their elementary organs, arises from a difference in the mode of growth. In ordinary trees, the diameter is increased by the formation of new layers between the bark and the wood; and as the growth is thus carried on near the exterior part of the plant, such plants have been termed *Exogenous*: while in palms, and plants of a similar structure, the growth both begins and continues from the centre; and such, therefore, have been denominated *Endogenous*.

With this variety in the structure of the stem, M. Desfou-



taines has pointed out a corresponding variation in that of the seed. According to him, plants, in which the bark, wood, and pith are distinct, spring from seeds that have two lobes or cotyledons; while those in which these several parts are promiscuously blended together, spring from monocotyledonous seeds. This opinion may, to a certain extent, be correct; but it is not invariably applicable: for while, on the one hand, there are some herbaceous plants, which spring from dicotyledonous seeds, that in conformation resemble endogenous stems, so, on the other, there are trees that spring from monocotyledonous seeds, which are said to possess a bark, and to grow in bulk like exogenous trees. Some botanists, however, carry the correspondence between the structure of the seed and the stem so far as to consider all acotyledonous plants, as mushrooms, mosses, &c. to be entirely composed of cellular tissue, without any appearance of vessels; whilst all that spring from monocotyledonous seeds have the cellular and vascular systems blended together through the entire stem; and all that proceed from dicotyledonous seeds have these two systems symmetrically disposed, so that the bark, wood, and pith, are readily distinguishable from each other.

Having thus exhibited a sketch of the structure of the elementary organs; of the mode and proportions in which they contribute to the formation of the different orders of plants; and of the manner in which they appear to communicate with each other, we shall next attempt to trace the course of the fluids through these organs; concerning which physiologists differ not less than on their structure. Thus some consider the vascular system as specially adapted to convey the fluids; others regard the vessels as conveying only air, and maintain that the fluids are moved through the cells; others believe them to be conveyed partly in the vessels and partly in the cells; and others declare, that neither the vessels nor cells perform this office, but that the fluids are moved through certain minute spaces between these organs, which they denominate intervacular and intercellular canals. The subject of the sap's motion will perhaps be rendered most interesting by associating it with the phenomena of vegetable growth, aided by such experimental researches as have from time to time been employed in its illustration.

If we take a seed, as that of the bean, we find it to be essentially composed of two parts called cotyledons, between which a third, and smaller part, called the embryo, is lodged. These cotyledons contain the nutrient matter destined to nourish the embryo in the earliest stages of its growth; and when the seed is made to germinate, this matter is gradually removed from

the cells in which it was contained, and conveyed to feed the embryo. The embryo, in consequence, augments in size as the nutrient matter is consumed; and by the time it is exhausted, the plantule has put forth new radicles, which contribute both to fix it in the soil, and to draw from thence the nutriment necessary to its subsequent growth and developement. When we contemplate this series of changes produced in the several parts of the seed, and consider the organic structure of these parts, as before described, we see no way in which the nutrient matter can be thus taken up from the *close* cells of the cotyledons, but by vascular absorbents, which deliver it into the vessels that convey it to nourish the embryo.

Following this growth in the plant, we observe the capillary absorbents of the roots taking up fluids from the earth, which are transmitted through the stem to the leaves, and employed afterwards to carry on the farther growth of the plant. Now, by what part of the stem is this sap conveyed? This will best be shown by observations on some of the larger plants, where the parts are most distinct, and in which the ascent of the sap can be most readily observed. It is, we believe, generally admitted, that, on its first rising in spring, the sap ascends through the woody parts of trees, and most abundantly through their newest and outmost circles; that no evidence of the presence of sap is then to be found in the pith, nor in the bark, nor between the bark and the wood, but in the ligneous part alone. Of these facts, the observations of Grew, Du Hamel, Walker, and others, on the natural flow of the sap, furnish abundant proof; and they are confirmed by experiments made with coloured liquors, by MM. Sarrabat de la Baisse, Bonnet, Reichel, Hedwig, and others; who found, that when plants were set to grow in coloured liquors, the vessels of the wood alone were coloured, but that no tint of colour was communicated to the bark.

That the sap, which thus ascends, rises through the vessels of the wood, is, we think, proved by many circumstances. These vessels, in the opinion of Grew and Malpighi, were of two kinds; one destined to carry sap, and the other to convey air. This latter notion arose from the vessels appearing empty at certain seasons, when the plant was cut across; just as the arteries of animal bodies were deemed air-vessels by the ancients, because they found them to be empty after death. But both Grew and Du Hamel admitted that these air-vessels carried sap in the early part of the spring; at which period, what is called *bleeding* of the vine proceeds, says Grew, from the air-

vessels of the wood; and the experiments with coloured fluids, before referred to, led Reichel and Hedwig to the same conclusion. Farther, almost all writers, from Grew and Malpighi down to Kieser, assert, that these tracheæ or spiral vessels are found in every part of the plant, except the bark and the pith. Indeed, M. Kieser considers all the vessels of the wood to possess a spiral conformation. Were they real tracheæ, destined to exercise a respiratory function, we might have expected them to communicate with the atmosphere, like the tracheæ of insects; but no evidence of any such communication exists, nor do we see why, on such a supposition, they should be found so abundantly in the root. The great force which the sap exerts in its ascent, and its rapid rise and fall under variations of temperature, as shown in the experiments of Hales, seem to prove, that it must move in the vascular part of the trunk; while the quantity that issues from a perforation in the trunk of some trees during the bleeding season, must require the aid of the spiral as well as lymphatic vessels to convey it. For these reasons, we consider the spiral, as well as the other vessels in the wood, to be employed in conveying the sap at all seasons when that fluid is in motion.

It does not appear to us, that, in tracing the course of the sap at different periods, sufficient attention has been paid to the development of the leaves, and the influence they exert on its movements: yet many facts show, that its course is very different before and after that event. In spring, says Du Hamel, when the sap rises vigorously, the buds have not appeared; when they begin to open, the sap then flows less freely; and when the leaves are fully developed, then the flow of sap is no longer visible. All bleeding trees, says Hales, cease to bleed as soon as the young leaves expand enough to perspire plentifully, and draw off the redundant sap; and, in an excellent experiment on the flow of the sap in a birch-tree by Dr Walker, he found the tree to bleed from every perforation in its trunk, and from every cut extremity of its branches, until vernal or budding began. Then, says he, the bleeding was almost entirely checked, and when the young leaves had pushed beyond the *hybernaculum*, it entirely ceased. Hence, then, the sap is visible in the wood, at its first rising in spring, only *before* the appearance of the leaves, and ceases to be so as soon as they are fully developed.

At the time, however, that the sap is thus abundantly seen in the wood before the appearance of the leaves, no trace of it can be discovered in the bark; whilst, on the contrary, *after* the de-

velopement of the leaves, it is no longer visible in the wood, but becomes apparent in the bark. The sap in many plants, says Grew, ascends visibly through the wood for a month in March and April; yet, at the same time, there arises no sap at all out of the bark, nor between it and the wood: But late in spring and in summer, he adds, the sap is no longer visible in the wood, but is abundant in the bark, in the inner margin adjacent to the wood. When the lymph rises abundantly through the wood in spring, the bark, says Du Hamel, is dry, and adheres to the wood, and no sap then issues from the bark, nor from between it and the wood; but later in the season, he adds, the bark yields abundance of sap. According to Hales, the bark of the oak separates easily when lubricated with sap; but before the leaves appear and perspire, the bark will not run (as they term it), but adheres most firmly to the wood. These facts seem to prove that the leaves are the organs which not only draw off the sap from the trunk, but by which also a portion of it finds its way to the bark. So great is this power in the leaves, that if a notch be cut in the lower end of the stem of a plant that is perspiring largely, though a great quantity of sap pass by the notch, yet will it be perfectly dry; because, says Hales, the attraction of the perspiring leaves is greater than the force of trusion from the column of sap. On the contrary, a cold day, or a moist and still atmosphere, by checking perspiration from the leaves, restores, more or less completely, the propensity to bleeding from the trunk.

That the leaves are the organs through which the sap finds its way to the bark, is farther proved by the fact, that the bark is again rendered dry if the leaves be removed. If we strip off the leaves from a young tree when in full sap, and whose bark is then easily detached, the same bark, says Du Hamel, will, in a few days after, adhere as closely to the wood as it commonly does during winter. So likewise Mr Knight found the bark of the vine to become shrivelled and dry when the leaves were stripped off, but in the parts where it communicated with the leaves, it continued moist and flourishing. By connecting, therefore, the circumstances attending the flow of the sap with the development of the leaves, we gain satisfactory reasons for the deviations it exhibits at different periods. Thus in spring, before the leaves appear, no sap can get into the bark; and, as no natural outlet for its escape from the wood then exists, the vessels of that part, when cut or perforated, readily pour out their sap, or bleed. But after the leaves are developed, the sap in part finds its way to the bark, whilst its larger portion is exhaled by the leaves: and, to supply this exhalation, the rising sap is so

forcibly attracted to the leaves, that it is no longer effused through the cut vessels of the wood, unless from any cause the function of exhalation is suspended.

This course of the sap through the vessels of the wood to the leaves was shown also by the experiments with coloured fluids, by MM. Sarrabat and Bonnet, who supposed the ligneous and cortical vessels to anastomose in the leaf. Its farther progress was traced by Dr Darwin, who immersed the leaf stalks of the fig and other plants, which have white juices, in coloured infusions. Afterwards, on cutting them across, he observed an internal circle of red points coloured by the infusion, and, exterior to these, another ring of vessels was seen to bleed out a milky juice. In a leaf of euphorbia, the middle rib was rendered red, and on the *upper* side of the leaf many red branches were observed going from it to the extremities of the leaf; whilst, on the *under* side, vessels carrying a pale fluid were seen to come from the extremities, and, joining into two larger vessels, descended into the leaf stalk. There is therefore, says he, a complete circulation in the leaf; for a part of the absorbed fluids are conveyed to the extremities on its upper side, whilst from these extremities it is again returned, of a different colour, and by another system of vessels, to the foot stalk, and afterwards to the bark. In similar experiments with an apple branch, Mr Knight followed this returning fluid through the bark, by the vessels of which it seemed to be conveyed to the roots. Whence it seems to be proved, that, in exogenous trees, the sap passes through the wood to the leaves, and the portion not thrown off by exhalation is returned from the leaves to the bark, and by its vessels is conveyed to the root.

This fact of the descent of the sap by the bark is farther established by experiments similar to those employed to prove the circulation of the blood in animals. If a ligature, for example, be made round the recent bark of a tree, the part *above* the ligature will swell, while that *below* does not augment in size; or if a circular portion of bark be removed, the upper lip of the wound swells from a superabundance of juice, and new layers are formed beneath it as usual, while at the lower lip no swelling is seen, nor are any new layers then formed.

The foregoing series of observations and experiments seems to establish not only the course which the sap takes in the tree, but the kind of organs in which it moves, with a force of evidence little short of that by which the circulation in animal bodies is demonstrated. They have failed, however, in producing the same conviction; and, within these few years, different physiologists have suggested other routes for the sap. Proceeding

on the supposed porosity of the cells and vessels, Mirbel considered the sap, after entering the vessels, to pass on all sides through their pores into the contiguous cells and vessels—an hypothesis which can no longer be entertained by those who deny the porosity both of the vessels and cells. M. Kieser, again, whose dissections have so much contributed to elucidate the structure of the spiral vessels, declares, that if there is one fact incontestably proved in vegetable physiology, it is that the spiral vessels do not carry sap. According to him, the common sap ascends from the root to the leaves, through small spaces situated at the angles of the cells, and called the intercellular canals of the ligneous fibres; and the ‘proper juice’ descends from the leaf to the root in the intercellular canals of the bark, and traverses also the ligneous body, by means of similar canals in the medullary rays. This view of the subject is adopted by M. de Candolle, who considers the small spaces situated between the several varieties of cells to be the canals through which the sap is conveyed. Those who take this view of the course of the sap, consider the vessels as canals destined to convey air, or other gaseous fluid; though M. de Candolle does not deny that, in some particular cases, they may serve for the passage of lymph.\*

We confess that we share in the surprise of one of the Interlocutors in the *Conversations*, who, on hearing this opinion, exclaims, that ‘it seems very extraordinary that the sap, which performs so essential a part in vegetation, should not flow freely through appropriate vessels, but be left to find its way as it can between them.’ After what has been said of the actual flow of the sap in the vessels in spring, and the reason why, except in peculiar circumstances, it is not observed in them after the developement of the leaves, we do not deem it necessary to pursue farther the refutation of an opinion, which nothing, we think, but the apparent emptiness of the vessels could ever have suggested. We shall only remark, that the air, supposed always to fill these vessels, cannot be deemed to serve any purpose of respiration; since that function in vegetables is performed not within the trunk, but by the leaves of the plant.

Another view of the course of the sap has been proposed by M. Dutrochet, in the small work which stands first at the head of this article. The motion of the sap in vegetables, he tells us, has been hitherto sought in vain, because it has been sought only in the facts of physics and of physiology al-

---

\* *Organographie Végétale*, t. 1. p. 60, 1.

ready known. An attentive study of the phenomenon has not only fully revealed to him its cause, but, in thus finding out the mechanism and cause of the motion of the sap in plants, he has found the secret mechanism of vital movement itself; and has even remounted to the knowledge of the mysterious agent to which that movement is immediately due. As M. Dutrochet's opinions have excited much attention, and it has been said, even in this country, that his discoveries form a new epoch in vegetable physiology, our readers may be curious to know what are the reputed facts which M. Dutrochet professes to have discovered in relation to the course of the sap; what is the nature of the mysterious agent which is not only the cause of its motion, but of vital movement itself; and how this agent exerts itself in accomplishing all these wonders.

According to M. Dutrochet, the sap that is absorbed by the roots ascends through the lymphatic vessels of the wood, and through them only, to the leaves; where it is in part exhaled, and in part converted into nutrient juice. This juice then descends in part through the bark, and partly through the alburnum; not, however, by the vessels of those parts, but by certain elongated cells there situated, and to which, from their alleged resemblance in form to a spindle, he is pleased to give the name of *clostres*. He goes on to say, that the lymphatic sap and the elaborated juice have thus each a special organ of transmission; that, if the former ascends, it is because it principally draws its origin from the terrestrial part of the vegetable; and if the latter descends, it is because it draws its origin exclusively from the aerial part of the plant. Sometimes, however, these natural motions are inverted, and the lymphatic sap descends, while the nutrient juice ascends; and these opposing motions become blended with another, proceeding in a horizontal direction through the medullary rays. All this, as well it may, gives rise to a general diffusion of the sap, and also to those particular effusions of it between the bark and the wood, which occur at certain seasons of the year.

We cannot say that this statement, though it certainly announces or involves new opinions in physiology, contributes much to dissipate the obscurity which previously enveloped the movements of the sap. We do not see, for example, why the thin ascending sap should thus be conveyed in vessels, whilst the elaborated juice has to struggle through a long series of cells; nor why an inverted action in these two systems of organs should take place, so as not only to blend their opposing currents, but to mix them with a third, moving in a horizontal direction. Neither the intercellular canals, nor the *spiral vessels*, are em-

ployed in carrying on any of these movements of the sap; but the latter have an office assigned them which is quite new and peculiar. Though it is admitted, that, in common with the other vessels of the wood, the spiral vessels receive coloured liquors when a cut piece of a stem is immersed in them, yet it is denied that they convey sap. They are farther said ordinarily to contain not air, but a diaphanous liquid; and this liquid, it seems, they receive from the leaves; for, besides being the lungs of plants, the leaves, it is said, derive a vivifying influence (*influence vivifiante*) from the action of light; and the liquid, which in the leaves may have received this influence, is transported by these spiral vessels into the interior of the stem. And thus the tracheæ of plants perform an office, it is said, analogous to those of the tracheæ of insects—the latter conveying into the animal system air, which is a vivifying gas, and the former conveying into the plant a vivifying liquid!

Of the mysterious agent which occasions these motions and changes in the vegetable fluids, we have next to speak. M. Dutrochet found, that if dead animal membrane,—a piece of bladder, or of intestine, for example, was formed into a little sac, and made to contain a solution of gum or sugar, and that the sac, with its solution, was then immersed in common water, the water, or lighter fluid, gradually permeated the sac, and became mixed with the solution. He tried similar experiments with several fluids of different densities; and, from the whole, was led to consider, that the lighter fluid tends generally to pass through the membrane, and mix with the heavier. When it happens, therefore, that the heavier fluid is contained in the sac, and the lighter thus enters to mix with it, then the action is termed *endosmose*, or impulsion inward. On the contrary, when matters are reversed, and the lighter fluid within permeates the sac to mix with the heavier one without, then the opposite term of *exosmose* is employed to express, of course, impulsion outward. The difference of density in the fluids seems chiefly of importance as a means of calling into action a more powerful agent,—the *mysterious cause* so fortunately disclosed to M. Dutrochet. This is electricity; a current of which, arising from the vicinity of two fluids, differing in density, or in their chemical nature, and separated imperfectly by a permeable membrane, may produce, it is said, the impulsions which the liquids, in these experiments, exhibit. The membrane itself exerts no influence, but only separates the fluids, and permits them to pass one way or other, as the reciprocal action of the two fluids themselves determines. Experiments are then related, in which, with a suitable apparatus, a current of electricity is made to pass



through the sides of an empty membranous sac surrounded with water, and it soon becomes filled ; or if the sac was previously filled, it is in the same manner emptied ; so that the two actions of *endosmose* and *exosmose*, are thus produced by electricity alone, and are said to depend entirely upon it. Electricity, therefore, evolved by the mixture of fluids differing in density, or in their chemical nature, appears to be the mysterious agent that is somehow concerned in effecting the movements of the sap : these movements are said to be accomplished in the following manner.

The sap enters into the plant by the fibrous extremities of the root. According to M. De Candolle, these fibrous extremities are all furnished exteriorly with a minute tissue of cells, which, like so many small sponges, take up the moisture in contact with them, and on that account are named *spongioles*. These *spongioles*, says M. Dutrochet, are the exclusive seats of absorption : they are surrounded with water, which they unceasingly take up, not by capillary attraction, but by *endosmose*, and being thus kept in a turgid state, the water newly taken in urges forward into the ascending tubes of the root and stem that previously introduced, with a force greater, as Hales has shown, than the pressure of the incumbent atmosphere. It is the united action of these fibrous extremities alone, we are told, and not any action of the vessel itself on its contents, that impels the sap forward with the force above-mentioned.

But fluids are rapidly taken up by the cut extremities of branches furnished with leaves and immersed in water, where no *spongioles* exist to perform the offices of absorption and impulsion. In this state of things, the cells of the leaves are said to act like the *spongioles* of the roots in the former case, though the analogy is not very obvious. A large portion of the fluid that enters the leaf is thrown off by evaporation, and as fast as the vessels and cells are emptied by this process, fresh fluid is drawn, it is said, from the contiguous parts to supply its place, extending even to the bottom of the stem. Now, this state of the cells of the leaf, as well as the former state of those of the root, is termed *endosmose* ; and whether, therefore, the sap be urged forward by the turgid *spongioles* of the root, or solicited to rise by the emptied cells of the leaf, it is all the effect of *endosmose*, though the one is termed an *impulsion*, and the other an *adfluxion* of the sap.

Nor is this the only difficulty which the hypothesis meets with in the leaves. Partly by the exhalation of its water, and partly by the agency of the air, the common sap is, in these organs, converted into the 'proper juice,' destined to nourish the plant. From the leaves, it then descends by the bark to the

roots ; and this descent goes on simultaneously with the ascent of the common sap. As this juice does not, says M. Dutrochet, descend from its gravity, it must obey an impulsion, the seat of which is in the leaves, the seat of endosmose. But how the cells of the leaves can, at one and the same time, and when in the same state of endosmose, draw upwards the common sap, and send the proper juice downward, quite surpasses our comprehension. This juice also descends through a series of close cavities, termed clostres, which are probably more or less empty, or contain a lighter fluid than that they are destined to receive ; and, therefore, we do not see how the successive states of endosmose and exosmose, necessary to the descent, can take place ; nor why the movement, if any arise from this cause, should not be made upward. As to the supposition that electricity aids in these operations, we see no obvious source from whence it can be derived. It is evolved, we know, in certain cases of chemical action ; but there is no ground for supposing such a result to accompany either the ascent or descent of the sap, whether it be made in vessels or cells. Even if electricity were evolved, its evolution occurs only upon mixture of the two fluids ; that is, after endosmose has been performed, and is therefore a sequel, rather than a cause, of that state.

With the aid of a voltaic apparatus, M. Dutrochet was able to convey fluids, not only through animal and vegetable textures, but through certain mineral substances ; so that, as M. Cuvier has remarked, the double phenomena of endosmose and exosmose are not to be considered as exclusively organic. In some experiments also of Professor Leslie, water was found readily to permeate a porous earthen ball, and mingle with the spirit of wine it contained ; or if the ball was made to contain the water, and was then immersed in spirit, the water equally flowed out to mingle with the spirit. This result is ascribed to the capillary attraction exerted by the pores of the earthen ball, which is so much stronger for water than for alcohol, as to give a passage to the former and refuse it to the latter. At any rate, there is no ground for inferring the presence of electricity in these experiments any more than in those of M. Dutrochet, in which water permeated the coat of a bladder to mingle with a solution of gum arabic or of sugar.

It is curious to remark that the gases permeate animal membranes like the denser fluids just mentioned. Dr Priestley found, that, when bladders, containing inflammable air, were confined in vessels of oxygen gas, a mutual transmission of the gases occurred : ‘ so that the quality of the air in the bladder and of ‘ that in the jar was very nearly the same, though the bladder

‘ was perfectly sound and sweet;’ and ‘ both kinds of air,’ he adds, ‘ were unaffected by each other, for both of them exploded ‘ when they were examined separately.’\* He obtained similar results with some other gases; and more lately, these results have been confirmed by the experiments of Mr Graham, who found that, when a portion of coal gas, or of common air, was confined in a bladder, and placed in a vessel of carbonic acid gas, a mutual exchange of gas took place through the coats of the bladder, and the two gases became more or less mingled together, both in the vessel and the bladder.† These results of endosmose and exosmose in the gases cannot well be reconciled, either with the law of density or with chemical action, as stated by M. Dulong; for the heavier gas in these experiments permeated the bladder more abundantly than the lighter one, and no electricity could result from chemical action, since no such action seems to have been exerted.

That, by the agency of electricity, fluids readily permeate animal membranes, was a fact, we believe, first made known by the late Dr Wollaston; and long before M. Dulong, various persons have sought to explain certain animal and vegetable functions by the aid of this subtle agent. Some indeed, and in particular the celebrated John Hunter, considered the vital principle to be very much like, if not identical with, the electric fluid. As far, therefore, as electricity is concerned, we discern no *novelty* in the opinion that it is the ‘ immediate agent of vital ‘ movement;’ but we admit that M. Dulong has applied this agent in a way, and to an extent, not attempted by those who have preceded him. No one before him, we believe, ever supposed that a most minute portion of turgid cellular tissue, situated at the capillary extremities of the roots, could, by the aid of electricity, or any other agency, urge forward the ascending sap to the tops of our tallest trees, with the force and velocity it has been shown to possess; and still less could it have been anticipated that a similar condition of the cells should, at a subsequent period, exist in the leaf, and propel the ‘ proper juice’ towards the roots. These are things not previously known or suspected, and could, we believe, have been discovered only in the ‘ new physics and physiology’ of M. Dulong. For ourselves, we recognise in these new terms of endosmose and exosmose, and in the use that is made of them, only a revival, in another form, of the old notions of percolation and filtration,

---

\* Experiments and Observations on Air, Abridged, vol. i. p. 178.

† Quarterly Journal of Science and Art, July 1829, p. 88.

which formerly prevailed in physiology; and which an improved knowledge of structure in general, and especially of the vascular system, had, we thought, consigned to oblivion. In this new physiology, the vessels seem to be regarded as mere conduits, exerting no action whatever on the fluids they convey; and the cells appear to be endowed only with elasticity, in order to counteract the turgescence to which they are exposed. By the simultaneous operation of endosmose and exosmose, kept up by electrical agency in every vesicle or cell, the contiguous cells, we are told, continually interchange their contents; their walls or sides being real chemical filtres, which permit molecules of a particular nature only to pass; in the same way as mechanical filtres permit the passage of particles only of a certain size. Such, according to M. Dutrochet, is the mechanism of *secretion*; and, in like manner, the functions of absorption and exhalation are said to be carried on, not through vascular orifices destined to those uses, but the conveyance of liquids from without inwards, and from within outwards, is effected by *filtration* through the walls of organic membranes. If such be the way in which these functions are performed, we certainly think the filtering apparatus of Mirbel, with its gradations of pores and clefts distributed alike over all the vessels and cells, much better suited to the task than the entire tubes and close clostres of M. Dutrochet.

That the author of these opinions, concerning endosmose and exosmose, should have been honoured by the Royal Academy of Sciences with a gold medal, is a fact more creditable, we think, to the liberality, than to the judgment, of that learned body. We doubt, however, whether, even with this high sanction, his opinions will make much progress among physiologists here. We have, indeed, seen it stated, that, as the cause of the ascent of sap in plants, these reputed discoveries are to vegetable physiology, what the establishment of the law of gravity was to astronomy. Of that law it has been truly said, that it ‘affords an example, ‘which is yet solitary in the history of human knowledge, of a ‘theory entirely complete; one that has not only accounted for ‘all the phenomena that were known, but that has discovered ‘many before unknown, which observation has since recognised.’ Of the hypothesis of M. Dutrochet, we venture to assert, that it not only does not account for the phenomena exhibited in the movements of the sap, but is, in principle, inapplicable to the facts it pretends to explain, and in practice incapable of exerting the powers ascribed to it.

ART. IX.—*Travels in Arabia, comprehending an Account of those territories in Hedjaz which the Mahommedans regard as sacred.*

By the late JOHN LEWIS BURCKHARDT. Published by authority of the Association for Promoting the Discovery of the Interior of Africa. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1829.

THE name of Burckhardt must be familiar to our readers, as that of one of the most enterprising and distinguished of those who, under the auspices of the African Association, undertook to explore the interior of that continent. There was none of whom there seemed ground to entertain higher hopes. His intelligence and hardihood, and that complete assumption of the Oriental character, by which he was enabled to elude the deep and searching suspicions of which Europeans are constantly the object, afforded the fairest promise, that he would surpass all that his predecessors had achieved in this dangerous undertaking. A premature fate defeated these hopes, and added another to the list of illustrious victims in the cause of African discovery.

Before this fatal close of his career, however, Mr Burckhardt had spent many years in the East; only, indeed, under training for his grand undertaking; but, in the course of this noviciate, he explored these regions more completely, than many who had made their discovery their sole and final object. His first publication brought a great accession to our acquaintance with Syria and Palestine, particularly with the back settlements of those countries; the seat, at distant eras, of commerce and splendour. His excursion through Nubia led the English reader in several directions through dark and barbarous regions, before imperfectly known; and traced one of the great lines of the slave and caravan trade across Africa. From Nubia, he passed over into Arabia; his travels through which, forming the subject of the present volumes, undoubtedly surpass in interest those that preceded them. Having accomplished himself thoroughly in language and every outward appendage, so as to pass for an Oriental and a Mahommedan, he succeeded in visiting Mecca and Medina, the holy Moslem cities, whose approach is so rigidly forbidden to unbelievers; and through him, we are now nearly as intimately acquainted with these grand centres of Eastern pilgrimage, as with Rome and Paris.

Few quarters of the world were less known to the ancients than Arabia, more especially that portion called The Hedjaz. They knew, indeed, little more of it than we, till very lately, knew of the inland regions of Africa. Gibbon considers

it singular, that the modern inhabitants should preserve no trace of the celebrated ancient division into the *Desert*, the *Stony*, and the *Happy Arabia*. But the truth is, these denominations were never known within Arabia herself, nor could be applied to her territory with any strict precision. They were imposed by the Greeks, only upon the most superficial view of her frontier aspects. The Desert was that forming the eastern boundary of Syria; the Petraea, or Stony, was the rocky tract extending south of Judaea towards Egypt; while the fine aromatic products of the Sabæan coast, the modern Yemen, caused an early communication to be opened with it both by land and sea, and procured for it the flattering appellation of Arabia the Happy. The very description given by Diodorus, of Arabia, as a country situated between Syria and Egypt, marks the limited extent of the region recognised by him under that name. These divisions left out almost entirely the great central regions. The author of the *Periplus*, indeed, represents its coast as beset with perils of every description;—hidden rocks, shoals, storms, and, worse than all, a fierce and lawless race, who doomed to death or slavery all whom the tempest drove upon their inhospitable shores. After touching, therefore, at Leuke Kome, (Moilah,) the port of Idumea, the mariners studiously kept the centre of the Gulf, till they reached Gebel Tor, on the borders of Yemen.

Nothing more decidedly marks the profound ignorance under which the ancients here laboured, than that they should have included the Hedjaz as part of Arabia the Happy. This false appellation seems to have sadly misled Aelius Gallus, sent by Augustus to achieve the conquest, and appropriate the wealth, of Arabia. Having landed at Leuke Kome, he appears to have expected to find himself at once in the heart of the region of beauty and perfume; whereas he was doomed to wander for six months through pathless and burning deserts. Everywhere, indeed, he drove the enemy before him; but his troops, through famine, sickness, and fatigue, sunk into so reduced a state, that when only within two days' march of the aromatic region, he was obliged to return. He reached Alexandria with the loss of only seven men by the sword; but with his armament, from other causes, in the most reduced condition.

No farther attempts appear to have been made to conquer Arabia; and Strabo does not assign any names which can be identified with modern sites. Two centuries later, however, we find Ptolemy marking some positions which can be recognised;—Macoraba, on the site of Mecca; Zabran, on that of Jidda; and Yambia, on that of Yambo, the port of Medina. He mentions also, as a detached tribe, the Saracens; a name afterwards so

famous, when it was extended to embrace all the tented inhabitants of those immense plains, who ranged themselves under the standard of the Prophet.

From this profound obscurity, Mecca and its environs were drawn by that remarkable revolution, which gave a new worship to the nations of the East. No mere mortal, surely, ever exercised such an influence on the destiny, moral, political, and religious, of the human race, as Mahommed. He has, for ages, moulded all the habits and modes of thought and action among upwards of a hundred millions of men, inhabiting the fairest portions of the earth. No influence, perhaps, was ever less merited. Mahommed was an illiterate barbarian, possessing eminently the talents of a chieftain and a statesman, but very slenderly those of an intellectual teacher. It was the sword almost alone, which, on this immense scale, gave laws to human thought. And yet, how strange are the vicissitudes of mortal fate! The religion imposed by this barbarous process has ultimately inspired a deeper and more dogged conviction, than others founded on the loftiest principles, and supported by the clearest evidence. The creed of Mahommed, as respected his original votaries, appears to have exhibited a strange mixture of licentiousness and hypocrisy. Full scope was allowed to the favourite propensities of his followers, while a show of austerity was maintained, by rigidly prohibiting what they had neither the means nor inclination to gratify. The prohibition of wine in a country unfit for the grape;—occasional fasts, which the scarcity of food often enforced even on the wealthy, and during the mid-day heats, when to eat would have been almost painful;—these privations were redeemed by the unbounded scope given to polygamy and servile concubinage, and by the promise of a future paradise, in which the sexual gratifications were to be enjoyed in a heightened form, amid cool fountains, shady groves, and every object most grateful to Arabian sense. Yet when, by a progress which Mahommed probably did not at first foresee, this religion was carried, by his victorious arms, beyond the Arabian frontier, it became one of severe and real privation. The inhabitant of the cool and plentiful vales of Southern Europe and Upper Asia was thus compelled to starve in the midst of abundance; while the wines of Chios and Shiras stood untasted, or were snatched only in stolen and gentle draughts. The Moslem system, however, was by that time committed, and could not retract; it assumed everywhere a stern and austere aspect; and even the license which it allowed, combined as it was with the seclusion and almost slavery of the female sex, served only to deepen the gloom which it spread over society.

The obligation of pilgrimage to Mecca rendered it the most conspicuous object in the eyes of Mahomedans—the polar star, as it were, around which the whole East revolved. To Europeans, however, it became shrouded in deeper mystery. Instant death to every unbeliever who should enter the holy precincts was, from the first, a fundamental principle of Moslem institutions. The travellers, to whom we are indebted for our general knowledge of Arabia, could learn by report only, the scenes which passed at Mecca and Medina. Niebuhr, when resident at Jidda, was warned against even approaching the gate which led towards Mecca; and more lately, when some English officers, trusting to the favour of the Pacha of Egypt, ventured to take a walk beyond this limit, a damsel was heard to surmise, that the world must assuredly be approaching its end, when unbelievers were seen treading on this holy ground.

Notwithstanding this terrific prohibition, several European travellers, under the real or feigned character of Mussulmen, contrived to find their way within this sacred and forbidden territory. The first was one of the earliest of modern travellers, who, in the original Latin edition of his work, in 1503, names himself simply ‘Ludovico, Roman Patrician;’ but from the Spanish translation, and the Italian one inserted in Ramusio’s collection,\* his surname appears to have been Barthema. Having arrived at Damascus, just as the great band of pilgrims was about to depart under the escort of sixty Mamelukes, he contrived, chiefly, as he intimates, through the influence of money, to insinuate himself into the favour of their commander. Thus he got himself equipped *en Mameluke*, and set forth as one of the guardians of the caravan. The march was not without fear and peril: he was obliged to join in repelling the attack of a numerous band of Arabs, and he was near being overwhelmed by the moving sands between Mecca and Medina. He succeeded, however, in visiting both cities; and at Mecca, putting on the dress of a merchant, contrived to reach Jidda, where he embarked for India. Afterwards, one Potts, made captive in 1678, and tormented into a renegade, visited and wrote a curious account of these Mahomedan capitals. They have been more recently visited and described by Dr Seetzen, and by Bahdia the Spanish traveller calling himself Ali Bey; but Dr Seetzen made only a short stay, during which the pilgrims who resorted to them were few; while Ali Bey found Mecca in full possession of the

---

\* *Raccolta della Navigazioni et Viaggi*, tom. 1



fierce and heretical Wahabees, whose presence scared away the numerous bands of orthodox devotees, who were accustomed to flock to it. Medina he could not even approach. Our present traveller, on the contrary, arrived at the moment when the arms of Mahommed Ali had re-opened the holy cities to the whole body of true believers; and Mecca was again filled with pilgrim worshippers from the remotest extremities of the east and the west. Having observed this remarkable region also at more leisure, and with a more intelligent eye, than his predecessors, he has left little to add to our information respecting it.

As soon as he had completed his Nubian tour, he sailed across from Suakin to Jidda. This port, which had been depressed during the domination of the Wahabees and the suspension of pilgrimage, was now fast reviving. It is the most flourishing of any in the Red Sea; and the name, which signifies *rich*, is verified by the large fortunes possessed by its merchants; amounting, in many instances, to between fifty and two hundred thousand pounds. This is consequent upon its being the port, not only of Mecca and the Hedjaz, but of Egypt. The coffee of Yemen finds here its market; and the annual Indian fleets do not ascend higher than Jidda. Its merchants purchase the cargoes with ready money, and send them at long credit, but a large advance of price, to Suez and Cairo. A laborious lading and unlading is thus incurred, which would be obviated by those fleets proceeding direct to Suez; but the large capitals of the Jidda merchants, and the tendency of all things in the East to remain as they are, will probably long preserve the trade in its present channel. Mr Burckhardt gives us a curious view of the course of mercantile transactions in these countries. The merchant keeps no books, at least what in Europe would be accounted such: he has a mere journal of sales and purchases; and the annual operation of balancing his accounts, and forming an estimate of his wealth, would be accounted impious. A merchant with thirty or forty thousand pounds of capital will often not even keep a clerk. He deals usually in one commodity; receives it from a correspondent in one town, and transmits it to one in another; and even if he carries on a retail trade, it is wholly for ready money. He has neither bills, bank transactions, nor any mode whatever of creating a fictitious capital. Hence bankruptcy is by no means common, and, arising usually, when it occurs, from obvious causes, is treated with lenity, and the debtor often makes ultimate payment.

Jidda, containing from 12 to 15,000 inhabitants, appeared to Burckhardt the handsomest Eastern town he had seen. The

streets are spacious and airy ; the houses well-built of madrepora, and other marine fossils, which are not durable, but have a gay appearance. There is one very handsome street facing the sea, and consisting chiefly of shops and spacious khans for the accommodation of the merchants. The surrounding country is a perfect desert ; rain-water is considered a luxury ; grain is brought from Egypt ; fruits from Yemen, scarce, and in bad condition ; milk can hardly be obtained for money. The only produce with which all the Hedjaz abounds, is honey—a primary element in Arab cookery.

The traveller being distressed, and his movements paralyzed, through his letter of credit on Jidda not being honoured, he betought himself of applying to Mahommed Ali, Pasha of Egypt ; who, having beaten the Wahabees, and delivered, or rather subdued Mecca, was now resident at Tayf, a city situated at a little distance in the interior. The Pasha, who had seen him at Cairo, sent a gracious reply, with an order on the Collector of Customs for a suit of clothes, and five hundred piastres. Burekhardt, who had, meantime, received a supply from an unexpected quarter, disdained the gift, as poor and eleemosynary ; but he durst not refuse either it or the invitation.

The route from Jidda to Tayf forms a continued, though gentle ascent, across a sandy plain, with rocky hills on each side. Of Mecca, through which the route passed, he was allowed only a partial glimpse, but he trusted soon to have a more full survey. In approaching the mountain district of Tayf, there occurred a spot called Ras-el-Kora, which appeared the most beautiful he had seen in the East, since leaving the wooded steepes of Lebanon. It consisted of an elevated plain, interspersed with lofty trees and fragments of granite, through which meandered rivulets, bordered with green Alpine turf. After having so long traversed scorched and sandy deserts, the cool mountain breeze was peculiarly refreshing ; the leaves were covered with balmy dew, while every tree and shrub exhaled a delicious fragrance. Wheat, barley, and other grains, were cultivated ; even grapes came to perfection, though in small quantity, reserved for the tables of the rich. Many such fertile and delightful valleys are described, as intervening between the rocky ridges of the Upper Hedjaz.

Tayf is a small fortified town, in the mountainous valley of Mohram ; which is productive, though not nearly so fine as Ras-el-Kora. Here he was very courteously received by Mahommed Ali. At the first public audience, Mahommed was encircled by a band of officers, with Bedouin chiefs squatted on

the floor ; but this was followed by a series of private interviews, in which the Pasha seems to have laid open, with great freedom, his sentiments and opinions on all subjects : and these conversations afford a curious insight into the character of this powerful ruler. The moment was critical ; for the tidings had just arrived of the first downfall of Bonaparte ;—his treaty with the allied powers, and his relegation to the empire of Elba. The Pasha communicated this intelligence, which he had just received from Constantinople ; commenting with the utmost freedom on the conduct of all parties. Bonaparte, he thought, had behaved like a coward ; he ought to have sought death, rather than have exposed himself in a cage to the laughter of the universe. Horror, however, was expressed at the conduct of his friends and generals, who were said to have proved Europeans to be as treacherous as the Osmanlis. The terms granted to conquered France appeared to him very unaccountable. He could not conceive what England had been fighting for these twenty years, when she had got only Malta, and some trifling islands. She ought not to have quitted Spain, unless she was well *paid* for it ; and how she should have evacuated Sicily, he could not comprehend. The terms, ‘ general security,’ and ‘ balance of power,’ conveyed no idea to his mind ; and he could still less conceive monarchs influenced by honour or the law of nations. ‘ A king,’ he exclaimed, ‘ knows nothing but his purse and his sword ; he draws the one to fill the other ; there is no ‘honour among conquerors.’ He thus showed himself a bold, bad man, insatiable in his avarice and ambition ; and who, if he benefited Egypt, did so only by substituting one tyrant for many, and by compelling the adoption of European improvements. Even his good treatment of Christians seems to proceed less from any liberal principles, than from indifference to all religion. Being unable to comprehend any disinterested conduct among princes, he was struck with alarm at the moderation displayed by the European potentates ; dreading under it some secret league, by which they were to indemnify themselves out of the Ottoman empire, and especially out of Egypt. The English he particularly suspected, in their forbearance, of having an eye to that country. The Pasha showed himself very little versant in European geography, when he mentioned, that by the late treaty, Genoa had been ceded to the Swedes ;—a statement which, when sifted, was found to refer to the annexation of *Geneva* to the *Swiss* confederacy.

Mahommed Ali made particular enquiry, how the administration of his son Ibrahim was liked in Egypt ; to which Burck-

hardt replied, what he says was the truth, that it was hated by the chiefs, but popular among the peasantry, whom it protected. Burekhardt was also strictly examined as to the route up the Nile as far as Sennaar, and what number of troops would be necessary to conquer all that range of territory. These questions were evidently put with a view to the expedition which the Pasha afterwards undertook in that direction. Burekhardt told him, that a small force would conquer the territory, but a much larger one would be insufficient to retain possession of it; both which predictions were verified in the sequel.

Mr Burekhardt, with some difficulty, obtained permission to repair to Mecca, where he resided four months; and became better acquainted, as he says, with that city, than with any other in the East. He has described, indeed, both it and Jidda with extreme and unnecessary minuteness; not merely exhibiting its general aspect, and the places visited as sacred, but detailing every quarter, every street, almost every shop, and the articles sold in each.

Mecca is situated in a narrow, sandy valley, which desert rocky hills, without any grandeur of form or aspect, surround like a wall. It contains neither trees, gardens, nor verdure; and water of good quality must be brought from the distance of twenty miles. The interior, however, is much handsomer and more gay than that of most Eastern cities; which consist usually of a crowd of narrow, dirty lanes, bordered by high mud walls. The houses are built of a dark grey stone, which abounds in the vicinity; the streets are broad, to afford space for the crowded processions; the windows are made large to afford a view of them; and as Mecca is a city to let, the windows are gaily painted and ornamented to attract tenants. Yet, amid this superficial elegance, there is an absence of any structures distinguished by pomp or taste, such as adorn its rival capital in the Christian world. In this respect, indeed, it is surpassed by the principal and even the secondary cities of Syria and Barbary, and still more by the magnificent monuments which the Mahomedans have left in the south of Spain. There seems a want of architectural genius or taste among the Arabs: perhaps, while the original mosque was considered too sacred to be touched, no other could with propriety rise to rival or surpass it. Mecca is decaying with the decay of pilgrimage, which forms its sole support; yet we cannot believe the contrast between its ancient and present state to be so immense as some writers represent it. According to Ali Bey, it contained once 100,000 inhabitants; now only 16 or 18,000. Burekhardt, after a careful calculation,

estimates the present amount at 25 or 30,000, with 3000 Negro and Abyssinian slaves. Barthema, in 1503, reckons six thousand *fires*, which would not imply much more than the present amount of population.

In this holy city, the holiest object, and which rivets the eyes and hearts of all believers, is the great mosque, called the Beitullah, or house of God. It seems to be, not the most elegant, or even very elegant, but one of the largest structures within the precincts of the Mahommedan world. It is about a quarter of a mile in length, and nearly as much in breadth: and forms, indeed, not so much an edifice, as a large covered square, surrounded on all sides with a triple or quadruple row of columns. Mr Burekhardt quotes various Arabic authorities as to the number of these columns. We know not why, amid these deep researches, he never thought of counting them himself: they appear to exceed five hundred. They are composed only partially of marble, chiefly of common stone from the neighbouring hills; and there is as little of uniformity in the shape as in the materials. They are united by pointed arches supporting small domes, which our author, still using the testimony of Kotobeddin rather than his own eyes, reports to be 152 in number. It is believed in Mecca, that this mosque, whenever it becomes too small for the crowd of worshippers, has its dimensions invisibly expanded by an angel, till it receives all who seek admittance; and that if the whole Mahommedan world could be here assembled, they would all find space. The truth appears to be, that it can contain 35,000 persons, which is more than ever desire to enter at the same moment. The area is pervaded by cool and fragrant breezes, produced by the many openings on every side; but which the faithful ascribe to the waving of the wings of the numerous angels by whom its gates are guarded. Except during the hour of prayer, the citizens treat this holy enclosure with very little ceremony. Porters and waggoners pass and repass on their way between different parts of the city; poor pilgrims establish their lodgment under the columns, having no other mansion; the empty spaces become often, without much animadversion, the theatre of frivolous and even indecent amusements.

This edifice was constructed almost solely for the purpose of containing another holier still—the Kaaba. This is a large, oblong, massive structure, built of grey Mecca stone, in large ill-cemented blocks. To perform the Towaf, or nightly walk around the Kaaba by the light of the sacred lamps, is one of the most meritorious of Mussulman actions, and which contributes most

to establish the character of a Hadj, or pilgrim. The Kaaba, according to the most learned comments, was framed in heaven, two thousand years before the creation; and the angels were then commanded to perform the Towaf round it. Adam made it his first concern to erect it on earth, immediately below its celestial site, with stones cut out of the five holy mountains. It was intrusted to the care of ten thousand angels, who, however, have been so extremely negligent, that the edifice has been repeatedly destroyed and rebuilt. It is enveloped in a vast black silk robe, called the Kesoua, in which are worked sentences of the Koran, partly in gold and silver. The Grand Seignior annually renews the Kesoua; when the old one, reduced often nearly to rags, is cut in shreds, and sold at high prices to devout Mussulmen.

The sacred character of the Kaaba, is chiefly derived from a still more precious object enclosed within it, and before which the whole Mahomedan world bows in the profoundest veneration. This is the 'black stone,' which Moslem devotion exalts high above every other earthly object. The story is, that Ishmael, being in search of a stone for the repair of the temple, met the angel Gabriel, who presented to him this, then bright and shining, but which the touch and the sins of believers have since smoothed and darkened. Notwithstanding the numerous angels charged with its safety, doleful vicissitudes chequer the story of the black stone. Once it fell into profane hands, and was broken into three pieces; but the faithful, on recovering possession, reduced the smaller fragments to powder, and employed them in cementing the three larger, till the stone regained its apparent unity. It is only on three high and solemn annual festivals, that the gate of the Kaaba is thrown open, and the pilgrims are admitted to the loftiest privilege which Moslem faith can confer, a kiss of the black stone.

We have not yet closed the catalogue of holy and precious objects enclosed in the Beitullah. At a considerable space beneath its floor, springs the fount of the holy Zemzem, endowed with almost miraculous virtue to wash away the sins of the faithful. It is enclosed within an edifice, continually crowded with pilgrims, who here find leathern buckets with which they may draw the most copious supplies of the sacred liquid. The well appears almost inexhaustible, from the circumstance that, notwithstanding the immense consumption during the day, a longer rope is not required to reach it in the evening than in the morning. This, by the Meccaways, is esteemed a miracle; but persons who had descended to repair the well, stated that they found the water flowing; consequently, it must be supplied by a subterraneous rivulet. The quality is not good, yet better than

that of the other brackish springs in this vicinity. The quantity drunk by many pilgrims is perfectly incredible. One, who lived in the same house with Burekhardt, used to persevere till he could neither speak nor stand; he then lay down on the floor till he had recovered the power of resuming the sacred libation. When by this regimen he had brought himself to the point of death, he was unable to conjecture any cause for his illness but the not having imbibed enough of this precious stream. The water, when bottled up, is conveyed to the neighbouring countries, where it is sold at a high price, and esteemed a fitting present for the great, and even for crowned heads. In this stream many pilgrims wash the robe which is to serve for their winding-sheet; thinking their souls will thus rest in greater security.

These high and various ceremonies—the prostration in the mosque—the walk round the Kaaba—the kiss of the black stone—and the most ample draughts of the holy fountain, are still not enough to perfect the character of a Hadj, or pilgrim. He must, moreover, go in pilgrimage to the Mount of Arafat, situated about twenty miles in the desert interior of the country. This is an anniversary, to meet which all the pilgrim caravans regulate their arrival; they proceed attended by all the citizens of Mecca; even Jidda is then deserted, and its gates are shut. The procession witnessed by our traveller was peculiarly splendid; being accompanied by Mahommed Ali, with his favourite wife, and by Solyman, Pasha of Damascus. The pilgrims were estimated at 70,000. A day spent in prayer, or dissipation, as the parties incline, is closed by a sermon from the top of Arafat; the being present at which finally completes the character of a Moslem saint.

The pilgrims who, in large and united bodies, move to this scene of holy observances, form four caravans,—the Syrian, the Egyptian, the Persian, and the Moggrebyn. The Syrian is the most numerous, most wealthy, and, in its passage through the empire, excites the deepest interest. Between Constantinople and Damascus, it receives continual accessions; festivals celebrate its arrival in the great cities; the governors supply the means of transport, and escort it with an armed force from city to city. At Damascus, the caravan is regularly formed; camels are hired; and every preparation made for crossing the continuous desert which extends from that city to Medina and Mecca. Individual Hadjs usually contract with a Mekowem, who, in consideration of two hundred dollars, supplies camels, regular meals, and every thing wanted on the journey. He even provides a guide for the camels during the night marches, while the rider, seated on the animal's back, enjoys the sweets of slumber.

It is deemed very unwise to attempt travelling otherwise than under the guidance of these Mekowems, who have various means of annoyance, which they diligently employ against such recusants. Every watering-place is guarded by a small castle, where the Bedouin chiefs are careful to attend and receive the regular tribute which is now paid. The Syrian caravan, formerly much more numerous, mustered, in 1814, only between 4 and 5000 Hadjs.

The Egyptian caravan is less numerous and less wealthy ; and, in passing through the arid and rocky wilderness of Sinai, encounters much greater hardships, which prove usually fatal to some of its members. The Persians, who muster at Bagdad, are few in number, and very wealthy. The odious heresies by which they are infected, and their wealth, expose them to heavy exactions. The Moggrebyn caravan, comparatively small and poor, is formed in Morocco ; obtains accessions from all the Barbary states, and finally follows the Egyptian track. Besides these regular bodies, a large and increasing number of pilgrims find their way to the holy cities individually, by navigating the Red Sea ; a course, on the whole, beset with fewer hardships and perils than that through the deserts. In this way come many Persian pilgrims, almost all the Indian, those from the eastern coast of Africa, and latterly those from Yemen. The visitants from the interior of Africa proceed in small detached bodies across the desert, by way of Shendi and Souakin.

Mr Burekhardt, though he had determined to brave the dangers of visiting Mecca, had never doubted that he would be exposed there to a more rigid scrutiny, and pass through greater peril, than in any other quarter of the East. He found, to his agreeable surprise, that there was no Mahommedan city where he was so little molested ; or where less enquiry was made respecting strangers who regularly paid their way. The truth is, Mecca subsists by the numbers and bounty of the pilgrims ; and it would be a manifest breach of policy to adopt an inquisitorial system as to their spiritual qualifications. Even the Persians, those detested heretics, who blaspheme the Soouni, and prefer Ali to Abubeker, have opened, with their purses, a way to the sacred cities ; and their deadly errors, if veiled for the moment, are regarded only as affording room for extracting more copious donations. The Ismaelis, also, though they labour under a still darker and juster blot, repair from different parts of India and of Arabia itself ; and, on observing a temporary outward conformity, are admitted to the payment of the fees, and the enjoyment of the privileges attached to the Hadj, or visitant of the holy city.

Commerce, in the East, is almost invariably combined with



religious pilgrimage and festival; and this holds pre-eminently in regard to Mecca. Here trade forms with many the primary object; and many of those whose zeal is the purest, seek, by a petty traffic, to lighten the charges of their journey. Thus Mecca, during the residence of the caravans, becomes an immense fair, where the productions of the most distant regions are exposed for sale. Mr Burckhardt enumerates red caps and woollen stuffs from Barbary; rich carpets and Angola shawls from Asia Minor; silks from Persia; fine cottons, sugar, and spices from India; and from various other countries, something peculiar to each. Scarcely have the multitude descended from the thrice holy Arafat, when the streets of Mecca are covered with sheds and booths, and buying and selling on a great scale commences.

Our traveller has drawn a striking picture of the Meccaway character, which, formed under peculiar circumstances, presents features wholly distinct from that of any other Oriental people. Originally a branch of one of the most illustrious Bedouin tribes called the Koreysh, they have received constant accessions from every quarter of the Mahommedan world. Motives of pride, of interest, or of habit, have induced numerous pilgrims, first to linger, and then to fix in Mecca their permanent abode. Though these foreign settlers have become the predominant element in the population, they have in a great measure taken the stamp of the original members. The Meccaways, moreover, have never been bent beneath that degrading bondage, which everywhere else accompanies a religion propagated by the sword. The Scheriffs, like other Arab chiefs, were found to rule chiefly by influence and persuasion; and conversed on almost an equal footing with the lowest of their subjects. Instead, therefore, of that abject servility which marks the character of the enslaved nations, pride of three kinds distinguishes the Meccaways; pride of family, spiritual pride, and the pride of being free citizens. 'The Meccaways are proud of being natives of the holy city; of being the countrymen of their prophet; of having preserved, in some degree, his manners; of speaking his pure language; of enjoying in expectation all the honours in the next world, which are promised to the hours of the Kaaba; and of being much freer men than any of the foreigners whom they see crowding to their city. They look upon all other Mahommedan nations as people of an inferior order, to whom their kindness and politeness are the effect of their condescension.' This pride is combined with none of that solemn and pompous gravity, which we have been accustomed to consider essentially Mahommedan and Oriental. On

the contrary, they are gay in the extreme; perpetually in search of a jest, a pun, a witty allusion; the smile of mirth seldom quits their lips. A plentiful subsistence, obtained by easy trade, or the performance of a few religious functions, renders them a tribe of gay and splendid voluptuaries. Along with this gaiety, they have an easy and engaging politeness, which, with the information and knowledge of the world, derived from their extensive intercourse with various nations, renders their conversation exceedingly agreeable. They are, in short, a race of gentlemen, as compared with the general stamp of even Oriental grandees; of whom many, raised by despotic favour from the lowest ranks, betray, by their manners, the rudeness and meanness of their origin. At Mecca, accordingly, they are despised as rough and clownish barbarians. Turkey (Turk) and Schamy (Syrian) are terms of reproach even among boys at play.

The polished and engaging exterior of the Meccaways is not combined with any very large amount of estimable qualities. They perform the most sacred rites of their faith with an irreverence, which scandalizes strangers, who, to witness these rites, have come from the remotest extremities of the earth. It has become common to remark, that a long residence in the holy cities is by no means conducive to spiritual advancement; and many pilgrims, who resorted thither in the hopes of attaining a much larger measure of sanctity, have lost even the portion which they brought. The abstinence from strong liquors, so rigidly enjoined by the Prophet, is nowhere observed with greater laxity. The Africans bring their *bonza*, and the Indians their *raky*; which liquors, under the frivolous comment of their not being wine, are drunk in large quantities, and sold at the very gates of the Beitullah. Mecca provides, moreover, for behoof of her devout pilgrims, a large assortment of public females and dancing-girls, who are so far from being discouraged, that government contrives to draw a revenue from them. At the sacred season, in particular, numerous adventurers of this class flock from all quarters, as to an assured harvest. They appeared, to our traveller, to form the most brilliant part of the Egyptian caravan. Even the short pilgrimage to the holy Arafat cannot take place, without an accompaniment of this description, which the government also turns to its own profit. The Meccaways are not guilty of direct robbing or thieving; but no scruple is entertained as to any indirect mode of fleecing the pilgrims, who are considered quite as lawful prey.

The wealth acquired by the Meccaways is profusely spent. Their tables are spread with every delicacy;—their halls are em-

bellished by fine carpets, and sofas covered with brocade. Their *fêtes*, indeed, are never enlivened by the company of the fair sex, whose separation is as rigid as in other Eastern cities; but the ladies give periodical entertainments to each other, when they mutually vie in expense and magnificence.

The wealth of Mecca, were it not thus profusely lavished, might be very considerable. Besides the easy and lucrative trade already mentioned, they have various other modes of placing the Mahommedan world under contribution. *Sarras*, or annual pensions, transmitted by the Grand Seignior or opulent individuals, are distributed by the Scheriffe among favoured citizens. In the service of the Mosque, a numerous tribe of Muftis, Imams, Khatybs, Muezzins, and other officers of various ranks, receive regular pay; besides presents, often liberal, from opulent pilgrims. Every one who has a house at all spacious or commodious, betakes himself to an obscure corner, and lets it during the period of the Hadj, at such a high rate as sometimes to enable him to subsist during the remainder of the year. A numerous body of about eight hundred attach themselves to the pilgrims as guides; in the discharge of which function they expect to be entertained at house and table, and demean themselves every way as persons superior in rank to their employers. Some are handsomely paid for officiating in a singular character,—that of husbands to female pilgrims, who are not allowed to approach the holy places in a single state. The marriage is contracted on the strict condition that, after having, in the double capacity of guide and husband, led her round the circle of devout visitation, a divorce shall take place on their return to Jidda. Failures in the performance of this obligation are said to be very rare, as they would involve the entire forfeiture of the guide's reputation.

There seems to be a singular extinction at Mecca of all the knowledge for which it was once eminent. The Schools and Colleges have been converted into lodgings, and the ancient Libraries attached to the mosque have, in one way or other, disappeared. Strangers who resort to the holy city, in hopes of becoming deeply versant in Mahommedan lore, can with difficulty find the most ordinary instructors. The Meccaway youths who feel any thirst for knowledge, must resort for its gratification to Cairo and Damascus. In the great mosque, only a few boys are taught to read; and though lectures are delivered, they do not embrace any useful subjects. There is much enquiry among the pilgrims after books, but slender means of satisfaction. A considerable number are suspected to have been carried off by Ibn Saoud, the Wahabee chief; who is represented as a

diligent collector of books, employing *secret* agents at Damascus to buy them up for him. At Mecca, from whatever cause, the scarcity is extreme, and the few found there bear almost double the prices of the Cairo market.

The route from Mecca to Medina is generally desert, but interspersed with fertile valleys; among which those of Djedeyde and Szaffra derive considerable wealth from the passage of the caravans. During his residence here, Mr Burekhardt suffered much from fever; but he has collected some interesting particulars of this city, formerly still more unknown to Europeans than Mecca.

It seems a difficult problem why Medina should hold so secondary a place in Mahomedan estimation. It contains seemingly every object which ought, in their eyes, to be most venerable—the tomb of Mahommed; that of his great successors, Omar and Abubeker; of Fatima, his daughter; of Ibrahim, his son, and of Othman, who collected the scattered verses of the Koran. It contains, moreover, the window from which the angel Gabriel delivered the celestial message to the Prophet, and various other spots connected with his life and history. At Mecca, on the contrary, all the sacred objects are purely pagan; they existed long prior to Mahommed, and are consecrated only by rude traditions of Adam and the patriarchs. Yet the pilgrimage to Mecca is not only much more meritorious, but is alone sufficient to confer the privileges of a Hadj; while that to Medina is a spontaneous act, for the mere indulgence of devout feelings at the view of so many sacred objects. The Egyptian and other great caravans never visit Medina; and it is not, on the whole, supposed to attract more than a third of the crowds that resort to Mecca. Medina is therefore a miniature of Mecca. Here, however, they fleece the pilgrims with equal diligence, but on a smaller scale. The people are neither so gay nor so dissolute; and though they dress in a somewhat more costly style, a more rigid private economy prevails. The town is well built, of dark stone, though exhibiting marks of decay. Its environs are by no means gloomy and arid like those of Mecca, but watered by numerous springs.

The pride of Medina centres in its great mosque, called El Haram, or, sometimes, the Mosque of the Prophet, whose tomb it encloses. It is here especially that costly gifts and jewels are deposited by the faithful. They appear not to be very ample, and consist chiefly in money, which the ministers of the temple prudently apply to their own exigencies. Hence this greatest of the Mahomedan shrines does not equal in wealth many se-

condary places of worship in the Catholic world. The most splendid object was understood to be a brilliant star, set in diamonds, and suspended immediately over the tomb of the Prophet. Ibn Saoud, inspired with fanatical zeal against every appearance of divine honours paid to Mahommed, and being, moreover, in want of money, deemed it a point of conscience to seize, for his own behoof, the whole of the treasure; which, however, from the best information, could not exceed 30,000 dollars. It may be observed, that the creed, which represents the coffin of Mahommed as suspended midway between earth and heaven, is entirely of European origin, and never heard of in the East.

From Medina, Burckhardt proceeded to Yembo, its port; whose trade, being confined to the supply of Medina itself, is on a much smaller scale than that of Jidda. The inhabitants are almost entirely Arabs, of the tribe of Djeheyne; a rude race, but who, in their conduct, seemed more regular and respectable, and, in their morals, purer than the inhabitants of the holy cities. At Yembo, our traveller found a malady reigning, the symptoms of which compelled him, with trembling lips, to utter the word *plague*; but he was adjured never again to mention such an idea, when he ought to have known, that a divine mandate had expressly excluded it from the precincts of the sacred territory. This reasoning did not satisfy the unbelieving mind of our traveller, especially when he saw forty or fifty dying daily, out of a population of 5000 or 6000. This disease, in fact, unknown formerly to the pure and dry air of Arabia, had been introduced by the recent close intercourse with Egypt; and from Yembo it spread to Mecca and Medina, where it committed the most dreadful ravages. The Orientals, according to Burckhardt, are not so wholly devoid of precaution on this subject as is commonly imagined; yet he admits they believe, that whenever the Angel of Death lifts his invisible lance, he will find his victim in the most distant corner to which he can fly.

From Yembo, Mr Burckhardt sailed up the Red Sea, and landed at Tor, a little village, with about twenty Greek families, who sub-sist by selling water and provisions to the ships that put in for refreshment. Here, a sandy plain, swarming with flies and mosquitoes, was little favourable to the restoration of the traveller's health; but a residence at the fine village of El Wady, situated on the high grounds above, amid gardens and date groves, happily effected that object. Having hired camels of the Bedouins, he proceeded in the train of the Pasha's lady, who was proceeding with an immense escort to Cairo.

Burckhardt, on his journey, had suffered severely from fever,

first at Jidda, and afterwards at Medina. At the close of this narrative, he considers himself completely recovered, and indulges in the most sanguine anticipations. His constitution, however, had suffered, it appears, irreparable injury; and soon after, a violent attack of dysentery put an end to his enterprising career.

The present work, with the exception of a few routes through the Desert, is strictly confined to the Mussulman Holy Land, and scarcely touches at all on Pastoral Arabia. It appears, however, that there are still materials for another, in which the Bedouins, and especially the Wahabees, will form the prominent feature.

---

ART. X.—*Library of Useful Knowledge. Farmer's Series. No. I. (The Horse, Part I.)*

*Art of Brewing. Parts I. and II. (Being the 58th and 60th Treatises of the Library.)* 8vo. London: Baldwin and Craddock. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. Glasgow: Robertson and Atkinson. 1829.

**W**E have made it a part of our duty to follow, as regularly as our limits permitted, the important proceedings of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, from the commencement of its labours. In pursuance of this plan, we shall now shortly state what appears, from the Reports before us, to have been done, since we last brought the subject before our readers.

The great objects of the Society are to furnish the means of instruction to those who are desirous of acquiring it, and to excite the desire of those who are indifferent about it. A vast proportion of the community are now sufficiently educated to be able to read: But of these there are great numbers who can hardly be said to derive much benefit from this power. They read but little, and what they read is of little use to them. This arises, in some, from want of time and money; in others, from want of inclination; in not a few, from both causes. Many of the poor are anxious for books of useful learning, but they cannot afford to buy them; or, when they have made a shift to procure them, they find them too abstruse for their understanding, in the limited time they have to bestow on their perusal. Many, in easy circumstances, have money and time at their command, but want books in which they can learn branches of useful know-

ledge without the help of a teacher. But many are also to be found, both in the wealthier and the poorer classes, whose minds are listless, or engrossed with other pursuits—debauched by pleasures, occupied with business, enervated by indolent habits—and who regard the effort of gaining knowledge as a toil, the pain of which is inadequately recompensed by the acquisition. To supply what is wanted by all these portions of the community, has been the purpose of the Society's operations.

The Library of Useful Knowledge is intended to furnish treatises on every branch of science and history, at the lowest possible price, and suited to every reader's capacity; from him who is ignorant of the first elements of science, to him who would reach its greatest heights. Sixty of these treatises have now been published: Among these are nine containing the History of Greece, which, with the Chronology and Index, is sold in a five shilling volume, containing as much matter as is usually contained in three volumes at four-and-twenty shillings. Another volume, containing one half of Natural Philosophy, is also now completed, and only two or three treatises are wanting to finish the second volume, which will complete the whole of Natural Philosophy. It is stated in the Yearly Report, that popular introductions to the subjects of astronomy, mechanics, and optics, are preparing, for the purpose of teaching as much of these sciences, as can be communicated to persons wholly unacquainted with the mathematics. And, in the meantime, the truly admirable Glossary and explanation of scientific terms, which has been published to the first volume of Natural Philosophy, of itself almost supplies this desideratum as to two of the three subjects.

The Society has now added to this Library a series of Maps, the first number of which, containing Ancient and Modern Greece, has been published. The Committee state in their Report, that 'in preparing them, they have had the aid of a distinguished hydrographer, a member of the committee, and that 'they are enabled to assert that no maps have yet been presented 'to the public combining fulness, accuracy, and cheapness, in 'any thing like an equal degree.' The specimen published fully justifies this assertion.—The maps are of the most perfect execution, and cost not above a third or fourth of the usual price.

When this Library is completed, the *first* object to which we have referred will be entirely attained—the means of acquiring knowledge will be afforded to all who seek it, and can afford the lowest price, in money or in time, at which it can by possibility be furnished. Suppose the remaining parts of physical and mathematical science to require sixty more treatises, while their applications to the arts occupy other sixty, and 120 are given to

the other sciences, and ten to history, the whole Library, consisting of 400 treatises, and containing matter equal to that of forty common octavo volumes, will be sold for ten pounds; or for eleven guineas, including an Atlas of sixty maps; while complete works on each separate branch of knowledge may be obtained for four or five shillings; and upon subdivisions of these branches, for a shilling, or even sixpence.

There will also be a gradation in the treatises upon subjects of difficulty, so that readers of every class, in respect of previous acquirements, may be suited; and those who have all to learn, may teach themselves, provided they can only read. But if the first object is thus completely secured, some advance is necessarily made at the same time to the attainment of the *second*—or the exciting a disposition in all classes to cultivate useful learning. For it is certain, that if you make any thing, valuable in itself, cheap, you increase the demand for it; and as the difficulties of acquiring knowledge are another impediment in the way of indolent persons, whatever lessens these, will encourage them to think of learning; so that, by making science at once cheap and easy, a considerable stimulus is given to the desire of attaining it.

This, however, we are well aware, is not sufficient encouragement for the love of useful information; and, accordingly, the *Library of Entertaining Knowledge* has been instituted, for the purpose of turning to some account the reading of that large class, in every rank of the community, who are not averse to all reading, but will consent only to read what is amusing. So large a portion of important information may be conveyed in this shape, that the greatest benefit is to be expected from this Library. Since we last mentioned it, there have been published five parts; that is, a second on Menageries; two on Vegetable Substances used in the Arts, comprising timber-trees and fruits; one upon the Pursuit of Knowledge in difficult circumstances, including Anecdotes of self-taught men; and one upon Insect Architecture, a subject of the most curious and interesting nature, full of science, and yet as amusing as a novel. These works are illustrated with a profusion of the most beautiful cuts. It is not wonderful that the circulation should be extensive; it is said to be twenty thousand monthly. The price is two shillings a part, or four for a volume of above 400 pages—some of the volumes containing above seventy cuts.

There is yet another class of men who will neither read for the love of knowledge nor the desire of entertainment; and to them our attention is drawn in the last place. It is plain that there is but one chance of making this *unreading* cast readers.



They are almost all engaged in some pursuit to which the bulk of their time and attention is dedicated. They may possibly be induced, therefore, to read what is of manifest use to them in relation to this pursuit. Their plain and obvious interest may lead them so far; and having once begun to read, their attention may be engaged by matters relating to their ordinary occupations, although not actually productive of gain to them. Thus a man, whose whole life is devoted to Bleaching, and who has no thought beyond it, may, very probably, be tempted to read a practical treatise on that art, in the expectation of learning some shorter, easier, or more gainful method of doing what he is in the daily habit of doing; and he may then have no objection to read a little farther, in order to learn the history of bleaching, and the processes used by bleachers in different parts of the country, and in foreign countries. But why should he not also be allured on a step farther? May not the principles upon which bleaching depends, be unfolded to him—the effects of light and air upon colours, in the old process, and the operation of ox-muriatic acid, in the new? In order to explain these things, some information must be conveyed upon the constitution of different compounds, and the action of substances upon one another. A little chemistry may thus be taught, and in a way to be received without the fatigue of learning it as a science; because it is taken in, as it were, with the reader's everyday business, and in its relation to that business. But he will, in all likelihood, not stop here; he will be desirous of knowing a little more; and this same discourse on bleaching, by well-contrived digressions, may lead him to the knowledge of scientific principles not immediately connected with his trade, though they lie, in fact, at the foundation of the rules upon which that trade depends.

We have taken one example from an art—a kind of manufacture, at least a chemical process. But the disinclination to reading is by no means so common among artisans, and others who live in towns, and are accustomed to meet in considerable numbers, as among the less gregarious classes who live in the country, and are engaged in husbandry and other rural occupations. Yet no class in the community has greater opportunities of improvement by reading, as far as time and leisure are concerned. 'During the long winter evenings,' (we quote from the Society's Prospectus to the Farmer's Series,) 'and when the weather prevents the carrying on out-door work, they have much time which might be employed in acquiring knowledge respecting those things which are most important to their welfare and support. It is, nevertheless, to be regretted, that hitherto less

'pains have been taken to afford useful information to the husbandman on subjects connected with his pursuits, than have been bestowed on furnishing information to manufacturers and artisans; and it may be added, that less desire for acquiring knowledge has been evinced in the agricultural districts than in towns. Much of the spare time of the husbandman has been wasted in utter idleness, or spent in the perusal of books calculated to hurt, rather than to benefit the mind, and to keep alive old prejudices and idle superstitions.'

To supply this defect is the object of the treatises recently added to the Library of Useful Knowledge, under the title of the *Farmer's Series*, and which is founded on the principles we are now engaged in unfolding. We consider this to be so important, and of such universal application, as to justify a somewhat more minute exposition.

The natural course of investigation has been frequently said to be the reverse of the course of teaching; the one being *analytical*, the other *synthetical*. We discover new truths, no doubt, by proceeding from things known, to things unknown; by collecting facts, and comparing them, so as to mark their resemblances and their differences, and thus to classify them; which arrangement enables us to deduce, or rather contains in itself, the general laws whereof science consists. When we would communicate the knowledge thus gained, however, it is said, we reverse the process—begin by stating the general rule, and then show how the instances range themselves under it. We cannot help thinking that this view of the subject is ill founded, and that the analytical form is better fitted for didactic purposes, generally speaking, than the synthetic. No doubt, there may always be this difference between the analytical process by which truth is *discovered*, and that by which it is *communicated*—that in the latter, the truth which the analysis has led to, *may* be announced before the steps that led to it are unfolded, which, of course, could never be the order pursued in the discovery. But it cannot be denied, that the order of discovery will serve for that of instruction as well; and that, even if it be so far inverted as to begin with the proposition, the proof will be most advantageously given analytically. To illustrate this by an example or two:

The ancient geometry proceeds by supposing the problem solved, and deduces the consequences; which leads to a construction; and then this is demonstrated to be the right construction, by retracing the steps of the analysis that led to it: supposes a theorem to be true, and deduces some proposition self-evident, or otherwise known to be true, and by going back from

this, it arrives at the theorem, and thus demonstrates it. But the method of solving the problem, and the truth of the theorem, are just as satisfactorily, and, we conceive, much more easily, and, if we may so speak, attractively, taught by following the analysis in these two cases, as by the synthesis: Nor would the student be the better for dropping the analysis in either, and beginning with the composition; or for having the composition after the analysis had been gone through; the analysis being plainly sufficient of itself.

Again, when learning the discoveries in any branch of physical science, we find that nothing conduces more, both to make us apprehend the truths unfolded, and to retain the knowledge of them in our memory, than to follow the course of the investigation which first led to the knowledge of them. It is not often, indeed, that we have the opportunity of doing so in physical, any more than in mathematical science; the greatest philosophers having generally suppressed much of their investigations; some from love of conciseness, others from the vanity of seeming to move more quickly, more surely, with fewer unsuccessful attempts, and with a longer intuition, than was perhaps possible for even the greatest human sagacity. But if we had a record of all the experiments of the physical enquirer, as well those which led to the results, as those which failed, and of all the steps of the mathematician's investigation, it is certain that we should profit more by following them. But next to seeing the whole of the experiments made, it is advantageous to pursue the course of those which actually led to the results. The Optics of Sir Isaac Newton gave, it is true, the results first, in the form of propositions, and the experimental proofs followed. But these proofs are truly the analysis—the trials which led to the discovery of the propositions. Nothing can be more analytical, therefore, than the whole work; and nothing, we will venture to affirm, was ever more purely didactic, nothing which more easily, clearly, and naturally conveyed a full knowledge of the truths meant to be unfolded, or in a form more likely to imprint them on the memory. The synthetical process uniformly adopted in the *Principia*, is unquestionably one, though certainly not the only reason, for the difficulty which learners find in making themselves masters of that great work.

When, by analysis, the discovery of truth has been accomplished, certain corollaries are afterwards found to follow, of great importance. In physical science, these are generally practical applications of the principles discovered. Thus, by experiments upon motion and force, aided by mathematical enquiries, the laws of the Mechanical Powers are ascertained; and from

these we are enabled to deduce certain mechanical combinations of the greatest use in the arts. So, in chemistry, by experiments on acids and alkalis, we ascertain the properties of certain salts; and from these we deduce a convenient process for bleaching. If we can learn the general principles correctly (as has been shown) by following the course of the investigation that led to their discovery, we can, not perhaps so conveniently, but still with great advantage, arrive at the same principles, beginning at the other end, and going back from the corollary, or practical application. To learn them scientifically, no doubt, the former is the better way; but its being resorted to assumes that the learner is desirous of pursuing the investigation, for the sake of getting at the results it leads to. If we have to do, therefore, with one who has no mind to take any such pains, having no fancy for knowing the principles as mere propositions of science, we must go to work another way: we must set him to consider the practical matter which he has a daily and direct interest in; we must show him how he can be made more expert and more successful in that, by knowing more about it than he can learn without book; and we must then lead him from the methods taught as matter of fact, to the principles from which they flow as the reasons for them. We are dealing with one who won't learn that the arms of a lever are inversely as the weights, by consulting the experiments and the demonstrations on which that truth rests; but who will be ready enough to know how he can make a little power go a great way in overcoming a resistance, and so may be made to understand how this is brought about. Or we are teaching a person quite indifferent to the properties of acids, or the laws by which they combine more or less easily with alkaline earths, but may willingly be taught how he may bleach in four-and-twenty hours, as well as in a month by the sun and the air; and who will thus listen while we show him that one kind of acid discharges vegetable colours, though others make them red; and that by means of mechanical agitation, that acid will combine with lime in sufficient quantity to bleach the cloth without burning it. Those persons will thus be led up to the scientific truths on which depend the processes they feel an interest in; and they will reach, by this route, a knowledge of some parts of science.

We have referred to persons employed in country work as peculiarly averse, generally speaking, to reading. In this, however, we rather follow the statement of the Society, than speak from the result of our experience in this part of the kingdom. The Scottish peasant of every description is, and has always been,

of a reading turn ; and we doubt if any portion of the industrious classes in Scotland be more disposed to spend their leisure hours in study. But in England it appears to be otherwise. Let us then apply the principles above laid down to the agricultural part of the people there. Cheap treatises upon matters immediately connected with their daily occupations, are certainly very likely to attract their notice ; and they will be inclined to read what may put them upon more easy and more profitable methods of transacting their ordinary affairs. But all that relates to the treatment of cattle, the nature of soils and manures, the construction of barns, machinery, or the processes of the dairy and the brewhouse, is more or less connected with different branches of science. In discussing what regards the breeds, the feeding, and the diseases of cattle, for example, those things are taught which are learnt from studying the natural history and the physiology of animals. It is easy and natural, in laying down the method of treatment, to trace the rules up to the principles on which they are formed. But when the attention is thus drawn to one part of the subject, another, connected with it, may be handled ; and thus there may be communicated, not only much information of immediate use in the every-day business of country life, but no little portion of knowledge in the department of zoology and animal physiology. In like manner, something of chemistry may be taught in discussing the various operations of brewing, baking, salting, &c. ; and in showing the use of farm machinery, and the application of power to draught, a good deal of mechanical information may be conveyed.

Nor is it necessary, in pursuing this course, that the books should confine themselves to a dry exposition either of the practical rules, or the scientific principles : whatever matter connected with the subject is interesting and amusing, should be intermingled with the more solid parts of the argument. All that relates to the history of agricultural matters ; comparative views of their state in other countries ; anecdotes of every kind concerning them, or those who have been devoted to them, form fit parts of the works in question, because they have a direct tendency to invite attention, and to fix it ; thereby encouraging a habit of resorting to books for knowledge, and for entertainment. Accordingly, we find the set of publications, which the Society announced in the Yearly Report as adapted to the circumstances of the agricultural classes, under the title of the *Farmer's Series*, is constructed upon these views.

‘ The first division of the Series will contain a history of the treatment and management of such animals as are useful to man ; to this will

be added an account of those animals which are injurious to him. In treating of the domestic animals, it will become necessary, in order to show how they may be best preserved in a healthy and useful state, to dwell upon their history—structure—food—habit—and diseases; and on these points the treatises will be full and minute; the information will be conveyed in a plain and familiar manner, not only showing what is best to be done, but expounding the reasons for that which is directed. In order to acquire the knowledge of the utility of animals both in increasing the power of man by their strength, and in supplying raiment and food, it will be requisite to enter into many points in natural history; and, in considering the best modes of applying the strength of animals, some insight into Mechanical science will be necessary. Again, with respect to articles of food and raiment, such as cheese, butter, wool—some of the leading principles of Chemistry will be explained. In order to add to the entertainment of the reader, and for the purpose of exciting curiosity and keeping up attention, (more particularly among those who have hitherto read books of amusement merely,) it is intended occasionally to introduce curious facts and anecdotes connected with the subjects under discussion; and drawings of animals, implements, buildings, &c. will be added for the purpose of illustration.'

We are now upon the application to country people of the principles above stated; but it is evident that there is no class of the community to whose intellectual wants the same relief may not be afforded. Whatever be the habitual occupation of any one, or even if he have no pursuit beyond some favourite amusements or indulgences, these may be seized hold of; since he is likely to read what relates to them, if any thing can draw him to a book. But there is no pursuit either of industry or of pleasure, which may not be referred to some branch of some science; and in treating of which, consequently, a portion of that science may not be conveyed to the most careless or listless mind, provided it be handled in a way at once perfectly plain, and sufficiently striking or amusing. Nor can we doubt, that, in a great majority of instances, whoever has thus been once seduced into the path of knowledge, will linger on it a good deal longer, and pursue it further, than is necessary for the full attainment of the special object he had in view when he first stepped upon it. Since the Yearly Report was made to the meeting of the Society, the publication of the *Farmer's Series* has been commenced. The first treatise now lies before us. It relates to the Horse; and embraces only a portion of that subject, which, in an agricultural view, is of great importance and considerable extent. After a general historical sketch, the different foreign breeds of horses are described at length, with their distinguishing qualities, and whatever is most remarkable in their history. This part of the treatise abounds in curious anecdotes from the writings of travellers.

We then have the history of the English horse, in all its kinds ; and the treatise is accompanied with some wood-cuts of very great excellence. The more practical portion of the subject will naturally belong to the following treatises ; but even in the portion which may be reckoned introductory, a constant reference is had to matters of use in the daily business of life. The other domestic animals, which constitute the farmer's live stock, we are told, will then be treated in their order ; and also those animals and insects which are hurtful to him, and require to be destroyed and guarded against. The next division of this Series is to treat of the *General Labours of Agriculture*,—farm buildings and machinery, soils and manures, rotation of crops, different kinds of husbandry, plantations, road-making, draining, fencing, and a variety of other things particularly enumerated under their different heads in the prospectus. The third great division relates to the *Domestic Economy* of the Farmer and Cottage, in all its branches, for the particulars of which we must again refer to the prospectus.

We hear in some quarters a charge made against the labours of the Society, originating, as it appears to us, in great want of reflection. The condition, it is said, of the working classes in this country is so wretched, that knowledge is the last thing they require. They are ground down by want and misery of every kind ; they have no heart to improve their minds ; let them first be better lodged, clothed, and fed ; and when you have provided for these necessities, it is time to think of furnishing them with the luxury of learning.

To this we make answer, first, that the Society does not profess to confine its labours to the working classes. Its publications are adapted to all ranks of the community ; and as it must be well aware that improvement always begins at the higher, and descends from thence to the humbler classes, so its efforts, in all probability, are likely to be more effectual at first with the upper and the middle, than with the lower ranks. The nature of many, however, and the price of all its publications, being adapted to the body of the people, unquestionably they are comprehended within the scope of its plan. But we should give a sufficient answer to the remark we have cited, were we to say, that the distresses of the working classes, which are unhappily severe almost beyond all former experience, afford no reason against providing for their better education. No association of individuals, however zealous in their benevolent intentions, can pretend to relieve those prevailing distresses. But is this any reason for neglecting the good work which individuals, com-

bined like the members of the Society, have it in their power to perform? Besides, we deny that the information diffused among the people bears a reference merely to their mental improvement; much of it has a direct tendency to better their condition. Take the instance of those practical treatises, one of which lies before us,—that on *Brewing*. There is in this a distinct statement of every thing worth knowing in the theory and practice of one of the arts most intimately connected with the comfort of the people. True it is, that, in their present depressed state, the use of good, wholesome beer, formerly one of the necessaries of life to our working classes, has become extremely rare, and only as a matter of luxurious indulgence. This our ill-contrived laws, and heavy taxes, and daily wars, have done for them. But is it of no use to show how somewhat of the mischief thus entailed on them may be removed? how a change of the legislative enactments, without lessening the revenue, unhappily necessary to be raised, may once more enable the poor to drink wholesome liquor? If the body of the people thoroughly knew the legislative absurdities under which they are suffering, without any gain to the state, no government, be it ever so ignorant or prejudiced, could prevent a change in this branch of the system. But suppose the law to remain precisely as it now is, the treatise on *Brewing* shows plainly how the poor may be supplied with beer at one-fourth of the price now paid to the common brewer. A cottager, or day-labourer, it is true, cannot set up his brew-house, for want of implements. But ten or twelve can easily do it, if they join: and, one or two of them allowed to see the operations of the brew-house once or twice performed in any private house near, they can easily acquire such knowledge of the machinery as will enable them to follow the directions of the treatise; a very small quantity may be brewed at a time; and for five farthings, or three halfpence a-quart, excellent ale may be obtained by them, with small beer in proportion. But we hold it to be one of the inevitable consequences of the art of beer-making being universally known in all its details, that the present state of the law cannot long continue; the clamours of the brewers cannot possibly prevail against the rights and interests of the people; and the time must come when beer, as well as bread, may be bought and sold wherever it is made best and cheapest.

Before closing this article we ought to mention, that the Yearly Report of the Society contains a useful help to *Country Reading Societies*, and to Local Committees of the Society itself. The former are furnished with rules, selected apparently from



such as have been found to answer by experience. It is known that individuals, in remote situations, unaccustomed to the formation of associations, are oftentimes prevented from engaging in those important institutions, by the difficulty of making a beginning. They have here a set of rules ready framed, which they may vary and mould according to their circumstances or their inclination.

We shall conclude with the statement which the Report gives of those parts of the Society's proceedings and plans, which we have not already touched upon.

' The *Almanack*, which at first was considered as a matter of experiment, has now decidedly accomplished the object of the Society, in giving a new character to works of this description. The sale for the last year exceeded 36,000; that of the *Companion to the Almanack* has amounted to 16,000. The disadvantage which the *Companion* has sustained, in consequence of being published six weeks later than the *Almanack*, will hereafter be prevented, and both will be published on the same day. The best attention of the Committee will be devoted to giving every practical improvement to both. United, they will afford a complete annual register of all that is most necessary to be known in the successive changes and improvements in the legislation, the industry, the manners, and education of the country.

' The important subject of *Friendly Societies* has occupied the unremitting attention of the Committee. A moderate-sized volume, to be published at a very low price, is in preparation, the object of which is to unfold the true principles upon which those institutions should be formed, with their history and present state, and giving the tables most useful for conducting their affairs, with the principles upon which these are constructed. In order to prepare these tables, 2000 schedules have been circulated among various Friendly Societies; the answers hitherto received have, from various causes, not been so numerous as was anticipated, but they already comprise about 3000 lives, and afford valuable data for calculation. The Committee have received great assistance from the "Delegates of the Metropolitan Societies."

' Availing themselves of the zeal and intelligence evinced by the several Local Associations formed in aid of the objects of the Society, the Committee have instituted enquiries into various matters of importance, such as the statistics of different districts, their local advantages and disadvantages, local improvements and defects, with a view to diffuse the knowledge of what is useful, and impart to all what has been the happy result of the ingenuity or experience of a few.

' As education is the foundation of whatever can improve the condition of mankind, the Committee would consider themselves wanting in the most essential department of their undertaking, if this great object did not engage a principal part of their attention. With these views, the want (almost peculiar to this country) of a *Journal of Education*, for recording and circulating periodically all the improvements made in this department, in various parts of the world, has not escaped their at-

tention ; and they are at present occupied in considering how it may best be supplied.

‘ For better effecting all the foregoing purposes, the Committee have formed themselves into various Sub-Committees, with ascertained days and hours of meeting, by the regular adherence to which system the business of the Society is transacted.

‘ The Committee having thus described the outline of their proceedings, are under the necessity of adverting to the state of their FUNDS, and of appealing for continued and increased support on the part of the public ; as the sale of their publications, though large, does not enable the different publishers to yield them an income adequate to the objects which the Committee are anxious to accomplish.

‘ Among the causes of this result are first to be enumerated the number and greatness of these objects, and the extreme cheapness of the publications. It is also necessary to observe, that at the formation of the Society, its success was so much matter of doubt and speculation, that the arrangement for the first year and a half with the publishers involved a loss of about L.300. By a new contract, the profits are more fairly apportioned, but still are unequal to the expenses which it is necessary for the Society to incur ; it will be remarked, that the net amount of profit on each annual subscription of L.1, is only 8s. per annum, after deducting 12s. for the value of the 24 Treatises delivered gratuitously to each subscriber.

‘ The expenses of the office are of course great in proportion to the numerous and various labours of the Committees, nine of which are in constant activity, and the correspondence for obtaining all the information which it is desired to collect from Local Committees, imposes a considerable charge, while it yields no immediate pecuniary return. It has appeared expedient to the Committee, in some instances, to remunerate authors immediately on the acceptance of their MSS., without waiting for the period of publication. Not unfrequently they are under the necessity of making such advances at some hazard, and occasionally extra payments for manuscripts are required, and gratuities given for communications which contain valuable matter, though not such as is fit for publication ; and, above all, heavy charges are unavoidably incurred for correction of the press, in consequence of the minute and repeated revision of the treatises by Members of the Committee, and their literary and scientific referees.

‘ These sources of expense will, it is hoped, satisfactorily explain the necessity of the present appeal to the public for pecuniary support ; for without that support, the Committee will be unable to accomplish fully the great objects in which they are more and more encouraged to persevere, by the clear evidence of the good effects that have already resulted from their labours.’

ART. XI.—*Cours de Philosophie*. Par M. V. COUSIN, Professeur de Philosophie à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris.—*Introduction à l'Histoire de la Philosophie*. 8vo. Paris, 1828.

THE delivery of these Lectures excited an unexampled sensation in Paris. Condemned to silence during the reign of Jesuit ascendancy, M. Cousin, after eight years of honourable retirement, had again ascended the Chair of Philosophy; and the splendour with which he recommenced his academical career, more than justified the expectation which his recent reputation as a writer, and the memory of his earlier lectures, had inspired. Two thousand auditors listened, in admiration, to the eloquent exposition of doctrines unintelligible to the many; and the oral discussion of philosophy awakened in Paris, and in France, an interest unexampled since the days of Abelard. The daily journals found it necessary to gratify, by their earlier analyses, the impatient curiosity of the public; and the lectures themselves, taken in short-hand, and corrected by the Professor, propagated weekly the influence of his instruction to the remotest provinces of the kingdom.

Nor are the pretensions of his doctrine disproportioned to the attention it has engaged. It professes nothing less than to be the complement and conciliation of all philosophical opinion; and its author claims the glory of placing the key-stone in the arch of science, by the discovery of elements hitherto unobserved among the phenomena of consciousness.

Before proceeding to consider the pretensions of M. Cousin to originality, and of his doctrine to truth, it is necessary to say a few words on the state and relations of philosophy in France.

After the philosophy of Descartes and Malebranche had sunk into oblivion, and from the time that Condillac, exaggerating the too partial principles of Locke, had analysed all knowledge into sensation; Sensualism, as a philosophical theory, became, in France, not only the dominant, but almost the one exclusive opinion. It was believed that reality and truth were limited to experience, and experience was limited to the sphere of sense; while the higher faculties of reflection and reason were thought adequately explained as perceptions, elaborated, purified, sublimated, and transformed. From the mechanical relations of sense with its objects, it was attempted to explain the mysteries of intelligence; the philosophy of mind was soon viewed as a correlative to the philosophy of organisation. The moral nature of man was at last identified with his physical; mind was a reflex of matter,—thought a secretion of the brain.

A philosophy so melancholy in its consequences, and founded on principles thus partial and exaggerated, could not be permanent: a reaction was inevitable. The recoil, which began about twenty years ago, has been gradually increasing; and now it is perhaps even to be apprehended, that its intensity may become excessive. As the poison was of foreign growth, so also has been the antidote. The doctrine of Condillac was a corruption of the doctrine of Locke; and, in returning to a better philosophy, the French are still obeying an impulsion communicated from without. This impulsion may be traced to two different sources,—to the philosophy of Scotland, and to the philosophy of Germany.

In Scotland, a philosophy had sprung up, which, though professing, equally with the doctrine of Condillac, to build only on experience, did not, like that doctrine, limit experience to the relations of sense and its objects. Without vindicating to man more than a relative knowledge of existence, and restricting the science of mind to an observation of the fact of consciousness, it, however, analysed that fact into a greater number of more important elements than had been recognised in the school of Condillac. It showed that phenomena were revealed in thought which could not be resolved into any modification of sense. It proved that intelligence supposed principles, which, as the conditions of its activity, could not be the results of its operation; and that the mind contained notions, which, as primitive, necessary, and universal, were not to be explained as generalizations from the contingent and particular, about which alone our external experience was conversant. The phenomena of mind were thus distinguished from the phenomena of matter; and if the impossibility of materialism were not demonstrated, there was, at least, demonstrated the impossibility of its proof.

This philosophy, and still more the spirit of this philosophy, was calculated to exert a salutary influence on the French. And such an influence it did exert. For a time, indeed, the truth operated in silence; and Reid and Stewart had already modified the philosophy of France, before the French were content to acknowledge themselves their disciples. In the works of Degerando and Laromiguière, may be traced the influence of the Scottish philosophy; but it is to Royer-Collard, and, more recently, to Jouffroy, that our countrymen are indebted for a full acknowledgment of their merits, and for the high and increasing estimation in which their doctrines are now held in France. M. Royer-Collard, whose authority has, in every relation, been exerted only for the benefit of his country, and who, once great as a professor, is now not less illustrious as a statesman, in his lectures, advocated with distinguished ability the principles of

the Scottish school; modestly content to follow, while no one was more entitled to lead. M. Jouffroy, by his recent translation of the works of Dr Reid, and by the excellent preface to his version of Mr Dugald Stewart's *Outlines of Moral Philosophy*, has likewise powerfully co-operated to the establishment, in France, of a philosophy equally opposed to the exclusive Sensualism of Condillac, and to the exclusive Rationalism of the new German school.

Germany may be regarded as the intellectual antipodes of France. The comprehensive and original genius of Leibnitz, itself the ideal abstract of the Teutonic character, had reacted powerfully on the minds of his countrymen, and Rationalism has, from his time, always remained the favourite philosophy of the Germans. On the principle of this doctrine, it is in Reason alone that truth and reality are to be found. Experience affords only the occasions on which intelligence reveals to us the necessary and universal notions of which it is the complement; and these notions afford at once the foundation of all reasoning, and the guarantee of our knowledge of existence. Kant, indeed, pronounced the philosophy of Rationalism to be a mere fabric of delusion. He declared that a science of existence was beyond the compass of our faculties; that pure reason, as purely subjective,\* was conscious of nothing but itself, and was unable to

---

\* In the philosophy of mind, *subjective* denotes what is to be referred to the thinking subject, the Ego; *objective* what belongs to the object of thought, the Non-Ego. It may be safe, perhaps, to say a few words in vindication of our employment of these terms. By the Greeks the word *ὑποκείμενον* was equivocally employed to express either the *object of knowledge*, (the *materia circa quam*,) or the *subject of existence*, (the *materia in qua*.) The exact distinction of *subject* and *object* was first made by the schoolmen; and to the schoolmen the vulgar languages are principally indebted for what precision and analytic subtilty they possess. These correlative terms correspond to the first and most important distinction in philosophy; they embody the original antithesis in consciousness of self and not self,—a distinction which, in fact, involves the whole science of mind; for psychology is nothing more than a determination of the subjective and objective in themselves, and in their reciprocal relations. Thus significant of the primary and most extensive analysis in philosophy, these terms, in their substantive and adjective forms, passed from the schools into the scientific language of Tilesius, Campanella, Berigard, Gassendi, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Wolf, &c. Deprived of these terms, the critical philosophy, indeed the whole philosophy of Germany, would be a blank. In this country, though familiarly employed in scientific language, even subsequently to the time of Locke, the adjective forms seem at length to have dropt out of the English tongue. That these words waxed obsolete was perhaps caused by the ambi-

demonstrate the reality of aught beyond the phenomena of its personal modifications. But scarcely had the critical philosopher accomplished the recognition of this important principle, the result of which was, to circumscribe the field of speculation by very narrow bounds; than from the very disciples of his school there arose philosophers, who, despising the contracted limits, and the humble results, of a philosophy of observation, re-established, as the predominant opinion, a bolder and more uncompromising Rationalism than any that had ever previously obtained for their countrymen the character of philosophic visionaries—

Gens ratione ferox, et mentem pasta chimæris.

Founded by Fichte, but perfected by Schelling, this doctrine regards experience as unworthy of the name of science; because, as only of the phenomenal, the transitory, the dependent, it is only of that which, having no reality in itself, cannot be established as a proper basis of certainty and knowledge. Philosophy must, therefore, either be abandoned, or we must be able to seize the one, the absolute, the unconditioned, immediately and in itself; and this they profess to do by a kind of intellectual vision. In this act, reason, soaring not only above the world of sense, but beyond the sphere of personal consciousness, boldly places itself at the very centre of absolute being, with which it is, in fact, identified; and thence surveying existence in itself, and in its relations, unveils to us the nature of the Deity, and explains, from first to last, the derivation of all created things.

M. Cousin is the apostle of Rationalism in France, and we

guity which had gradually crept into the signification of the substantives. *Object*, besides its proper signification, came to be abusively applied to denote *motive*, *end*, *final cause*, (a meaning not recognised by Johnson.) This innovation was probably borrowed from the French, in whose language the word had been similarly corrupted after the commencement of the last century, (Dict. de Trevoux, voce *Objet*.) *Subject* in English, as *sujet* in French, had been also perverted into a synonyme for *object*, taken in its proper meaning, and had thus returned to the original ambiguity of the corresponding term in Greek. It is probable that the logical application of the word (*subject of predication*) facilitated or occasioned this confusion. In using the terms, therefore, we think that an explanation, but no apology, is required. The distinction is of paramount importance, and of infinite application, not only in philosophy proper, but in grammar, rhetoric, criticism, ethics, politics, jurisprudence, theology. It is adequately expressed by no other terms; and if these did not already enjoy a prescriptive right, as denizens of the language, it cannot be denied, that, as strictly analogical, they would be well entitled to sue out their naturalization.

are willing to admit that the doctrine could not have obtained a more eloquent or devoted advocate. He has consecrated himself, his life, and labours, to philosophy, and to philosophy alone; nor has he approached the sanctuary with unwashed hands. The editor of Proclus, of Descartes, and of Malebranche, the translator and interpreter of Plato, and the promised expositor of Kant, will not be accused of partiality in the choice of his pursuits; while his two works, under the title of *Philosophical Fragments*, bear ample evidence to the learning, elegance, and distinguished ability of their author. Taking him all in all, in France M. Cousin stands alone: nor can we contemplate his character and accomplishments, without the sincerest admiration, even while we dissent from almost every principle of his philosophy. The developement of his system, in all its points, betrays the influence of the German philosophy on his opinions. His theory is not, however, a scheme of exclusive Rationalism; on the contrary, the peculiarity of his doctrine consists in the attempt to combine the philosophy of experience, and the philosophy of pure reason, into one. The following is a concise statement of the fundamental positions of his system:

Reason, or intelligence, has three integrant elements, three regulative principles, which at once constitute its nature, and govern its manifestations; these three ideas severally suppose each other, and, as inseparable, are equally essential and equally primitive. These ideas are recognised by Aristotle and by Kant, in their several attempts to analyse intelligence into its principles; but though the categories of both philosophers comprise all the elements, in neither list are these elements naturally co-arranged, or reduced to an ultimate simplicity.

The *first* of these ideas, principles, or elements, though fundamentally one, is variously expressed, under the terms unity, identity, substance, absolute cause, the infinite, pure thought, &c.; we would briefly call it the *unconditioned*. The *second*, he denominates plurality, difference, phenomenon, relative cause, the finite, determined thought, &c.; we would term it the *conditioned*. These two elements are relative and correlative. The first, though absolute, is not conceived as existing absolutely in itself; it is conceived as an absolute cause, as a cause which cannot but pass into operation; in other words, the first element must manifest itself in the second. The two ideas are thus connected together as cause and effect; each is only realised through the other; and this their connexion constitutes the *third* integrant element of intelligence.

Reason, or intelligence, in which these ideas appear, and which, in fact, they constitute and determine, is not individual, is not ours, is not even human ; it is absolute, it is divine. What is personal to us, is our free and voluntary activity ; what is not free and not voluntary, is adventitious to man, and does not constitute an integrant part of his individuality. Intelligence is conversant with truth ; truth, as necessary and universal, is not the creature of my volition ; and reason, which, as the subject of truth, is also universal and necessary, is consequently impersonal. We see, therefore, by a light which is not ours, and reason is a revelation of God in man. . The ideas, therefore, of which we are conscious, belong not to us, but to absolute intelligence. They constitute, in fact, the very mode and manner of its existence. For consciousness is only possible under plurality and difference, and intelligence is only possible through consciousness.

The divine nature is essentially comprehensible. For the three ideas constitute the nature of the Deity, and the nature of ideas is to be conceived. God, in fact, exists to us only in so far as he is known, and the degree of our knowledge must always determine the measure of our faith. The relation of God to the universe is therefore manifest, and the creation easily understood. To create, is not to make something out of nothing, for this is contradictory, but to originate from self. We create so often as we exert our free causality, and something is created by us when something begins to be by virtue of the free causality which belongs to us. To create is, therefore, to cause, not with nothing, but with the very essence of our being—with our force, our will, our personality. The divine creation is of the same character. God, as he is a cause, is able to create ; as he is an absolute cause, he cannot but create. In creating the universe, he does not draw it from nothing ; he draws it from himself. The creation of the universe is thus necessary ; it is a manifestation of the Deity, but not the Deity absolutely in himself ; it is God passing into activity, but not exhausted in the act.

The universe created, the principles which determined the creation are found still to govern the worlds of matter and mind. Two ideas and their connexion explain the intelligence of God ; two laws in their counterpoise explain the material universe. The law of expansion is the movement of unity to variety ; the law of attraction, the return of variety to unity.

In the world of mind the same analogy is apparent. The study of consciousness is psychology. Man is the microcosm of existence ; consciousness, within a narrow focus, concentrates a knowledge of the universe and of God ; psychology is thus



the abstract of all science, human and divine. As in the external world the action and reaction of all phenomena may be reduced to two great laws; so, in the internal, all the facts of consciousness may be reduced to one fundamental fact, comprising in like manner two principles and their correlation; and these principles are again the one or the infinite, the many or the finite, and the connexion of the infinite and finite.

In every act of consciousness we distinguish a self or ego, and something different from self, a non-ego; each limited and modified by the other. These, together, constitute the finite element. But at the same instant that we are conscious of these existences, plural, relative, and contingent, we are conscious likewise of a superior unity in which they are contained, and by which they are explained;—a unity absolute as they are conditioned, substantive as they are phenomenal, and an infinite cause as they are finite causes. This unity is God. The fact of consciousness is thus a complex phenomenon, comprehending three several terms; 1. The idea of the ego and non-ego as finite; 2. The idea of something else as infinite; and, 3. The idea of the relation of the finite element to the infinite. These elements are revealed in themselves and in their relations, in every act of primitive or spontaneous consciousness. They can also be reviewed by reflection in a voluntary act; but here reflection distinguishes, it does not create. The three ideas, the three categories of intelligence, are given in the original act of instinctive apperception, obscurely, indeed, and without contrast. Reflection analyses and discriminates the elements of this primary synthesis; and as will is the condition of reflection, and will at the same time is personal, the categories, as obtained through reflection, have consequently the appearance of being also personal and subjective. It was this personality of reflection that misled Kant; caused him to overlook or misinterpret the fact of spontaneous consciousness,—to individualize intelligence, and to refer to this personal reason all that is conceived by us as necessary and universal. But as, in the spontaneous intuition of reason, there is nothing voluntary, and consequently nothing personal; and as the truths which intelligence here discovers, come not from ourselves; we have a right, up to a certain point, to impose these truths on others as revelations from on high: while, on the contrary, reflection being wholly personal, it would be absurd to impose on others, what is the fruit of our individual operations. Spontaneity is the principle of religion; reflection of philosophy. Men agree in spontaneity; they differ in reflection. The former is necessarily veracious; the latter is naturally delusive.

The condition of reflection is separation ; it illustrates by distinguishing ; it considers the different elements apart, and while it contemplates one, it necessarily throws the others out of view. Hence, not only the possibility, but the necessity, of error. The primitive unity, supposing no distinction, admits of no error ; reflection in discriminating the elements of thought, and in considering one to the exclusion of others, occasions error, and a variety in error. He who exclusively contemplates the element of the infinite, despises him who is occupied with the idea of the finite ; and *vice versa*. It is the wayward developement of the various elements of intelligence, that determines the imperfections and varieties of individual character. Men under this partial and exclusive developement, are but fragments of that humanity which can only be fully realized in the harmonious evolution of all its principles. What reflection is to the individual, history is to the human race. The difference of an epoch consists exclusively in the partial developement of some one element of intelligence in a prominent portion of mankind ; and as there are only three such elements, so there are only three grand epochs in the history of man.

A knowledge of the elements of reason, of their relations and of their laws, constitutes not merely philosophy, but the conditions of a history of philosophy. The history of human reason, or the history of philosophy, must be rational and philosophic. It must be philosophy itself, with all its elements, with all their relations, and with all their laws, represented in striking characters by the hands of time and of history, in the visible progress of the human mind. The discovery and enumeration of all the elements of intelligence enables us to survey the progress of speculation from the loftiest vantage ground ; it discovers to us the laws by which the developement of reflection or philosophy is determined ; and it supplies us with a canon by which the approximation of the different systems to the truth may be finally ascertained. And what are the results ? Sensualism, idealism, scepticism, mysticism, are all partial and exclusive views of the elements of intelligence. But each is false only as it is incomplete. They are all true in what they affirm—all erroneous in what they deny. Though hitherto opposed, they are consequently not incapable of coalition ; and, in fact, can only obtain their consummation in a powerful *Eclecticism*, which shall comprehend them all. This Eclecticism is contained in the system previously developed ; and the possibility of such a universal philosophy was first afforded by the discovery of M. Cousin, in the year 1817, ‘ that consciousness contained many more ‘ phenomena than had previously been suspected.’

The present work is at once an exposition of these principles, as a true theory of philosophy, and an illustration of the mode in which this theory is to be applied, as a rule of criticism in the history of philosophical opinion. As the justice of the application must be always subordinate to the truth of the principle, we shall confine ourselves exclusively to a consideration of M. Cousin's system, viewed absolutely in itself. This, indeed, we are afraid will prove comparatively irksome; and we must solicit indulgence not only for the unpopular nature of the discussion, but for the employment of language which, from the total neglect of these speculations in Britain, will necessarily appear abstruse to the general reader.

Now, it is manifest that the whole doctrine of M. Cousin is involved in the proposition, that the unconditioned, the absolute, the infinite, is immediately known in consciousness by difference, plurality, and relation. The unconditioned, as an original element of knowledge, is the generative principle of his system; the mode in which the possibility of this knowledge is explained, affords its discriminating peculiarity. The other positions of his theory, as deduced from this assumption, may indeed be disputed, even if the antecedent be allowed; but this assumption disproved, every consequent in his theory is at once annihilated. The recognition of the absolute as a constitutive principle of intelligence, our author regards as at once the condition and the end of philosophy; and it is on the discovery of this principle in the fact of consciousness, that he vindicates to himself the glory of being the founder of the eclectic, or one catholic philosophy. The determination of this cardinal point will thus satisfy us at once touching the pretensions of the system. To explain the nature of the problem itself, and the character of the solution propounded by M. Cousin, it is necessary to premise a statement of the opinions that may be entertained regarding the unconditioned, as an immediate object of knowledge and of thought.

These opinions may be reduced to four:—1. The unconditioned is incognisable and inconceivable; its notion being only negative of the conditioned, which last can alone be positively known or conceived. 2. It is not an object of knowledge; but its notion, as a regulative principle of the mind itself, is more than a mere negation of the conditioned. 3. It is cognisable, but not conceivable; it can be known by a sinking back into identity with the absolute, but is incomprehensible by consciousness and reflection, which are only of the relative and the different. 4. It is cognisable and conceivable by consciousness and reflection, under relation, difference, and plurality.

The first of these opinions we regard as true; the second is held by Kant; the third by Schelling; and the last by our author.

1. In our opinion, the mind can conceive, and consequently can know, only the *limited*, and the *conditionally limited*. The unconditionally unlimited, or the *infinite*, the unconditionally limited, or the *absolute*, cannot positively be construed to the mind; they can be conceived at all only by a thinking away, or abstraction, of those very conditions under which thought itself is realized; consequently, the notion of the unconditioned is only negative,—negative of the conceivable itself. For example, on the one hand we can positively conceive neither an absolute whole, that is, a whole so great, that we cannot also conceive it as a relative part of a still greater whole; nor an absolute part, that is, a part so small, that we cannot also conceive it as a relative whole, divisible into smaller parts. On the other hand, we cannot positively represent to the mind an infinite whole, for this could only be done by the infinite synthesis in thought of finite wholes, which would itself require an infinite time for its accomplishment; nor, for the same reason, can we follow out in thought an infinite divisibility of parts. The result is the same, whether we apply the process to limitation in space, in time, or in degree. The unconditional negation, and the unconditional affirmation of limitation; in other words, the *infinite* and the *absolute*, *properly so called*,\* are thus equally inconceivable to us.

As the conditionally limited (which we may briefly call the conditioned) is thus the only object of knowledge and of positive thought—thought necessarily supposes conditions; to think is therefore to condition, and conditional limitation is the fundamental law of the possibility of thought. How, indeed, it could ever be doubted that thought is only of the conditioned, may well be deemed a matter of the profoundest admiration. Thought cannot transcend consciousness; consciousness is only possible under the antithesis of a subject and object of thought, known only in correlation, and mutually limiting each other; while, independently of this, all that we know either of subject or object, either of mind or matter, is only a knowledge in each of the particular, of the different, of the modified, of the pheno-

---

\* It is proper to observe, that though we are of opinion that the terms, Infinite, and Absolute, and Unconditioned, ought not to be confounded, and accurately distinguish them in the statement of our own view; yet, in speaking of the doctrines of those by whom they are indifferently employed, we have not thought it necessary, or rather we have found it impossible, to adhere to the distinction.

menal. We admit that the consequence of this doctrine is, that philosophy, if viewed as more than a science of the conditioned, is impossible. Departing from the particular, we admit that we can never, in our highest generalizations, rise above the finite; that our knowledge, whether of mind or matter, can be nothing more than a knowledge of the relative manifestations of an existence which in itself it is our highest wisdom to recognise as beyond the reach of philosophy:—*Cognoscendo ignorari, et ignorando cognosci*.

The conditioned is the mean between two extremes, exclusive of each other, neither of which can be conceived as *possible*, but of which, on the principle of contradiction, one must be admitted as *necessary*. On this opinion, therefore, reason is shown to be weak, but not deceitful. The mind is not represented as conceiving two propositions subversive of each other as equally possible; but only as unable to understand as possible, either of two extremes; one of which, however, on the ground of their mutual contradiction, it is compelled to recognise as true. We are thus taught the salutary lesson, that the capacity of thought is not to be constituted into the measure of existence; and are warned from recognising the domain of our knowledge as necessarily co-extensive with the horizon of our faith. And by a wonderful revelation, we are thus, in the very consciousness of our inability to conceive aught beyond the relative and finite, inspired with a belief in the existence of something unconditioned beyond the sphere of all comprehensible reality.

2. The second opinion, that of Kant, is fundamentally the same as the preceding. Metaphysic, strictly so denominated, is the doctrine of the unconditioned. From Xenophanes to Leibnitz, the infinite, the absolute, formed the highest principle of speculation; but from the dawn of philosophy in the school of Elis till the rise of the Kantian philosophy, no serious attempt was made to investigate the nature and origin of this notion as a psychological phenomenon. Before Kant, philosophy was rather a deduction from principles, than an enquiry concerning principles themselves. At the head of every system a notion figured, which the philosopher assumed in conformity to his views; but it was rarely considered necessary, and still more rarely attempted, to ascertain the genesis, or to determine the domain, of the notion, previous to its application. In his *Critique*, Kant undertakes a regular survey of consciousness. He professes to analyse the conditions of human knowledge—to mete out its limits—to indicate its point of departure,—and to determine its possibility. That Kant accomplished much, it would be prejudice to deny; nor is his service to philosophy the less,

that his success has been more decided in the subversion of error than in the establishment of truth. The result of his examination was the abolition of the metaphysical sciences—of rational psychology, ontology, speculative theology, &c., as founded on mere *petitiones principiorum*. Existence was revealed to us only under specific modifications, and these were known only under the conditions of our faculties of knowledge. ‘Things in themselves,’ mind, matter, God,—all, in short, that was not particular, relative, and phenomenal, as bearing no analogy to our faculties, was beyond the verge of our knowledge. Philosophy was thus restricted to the observation and analysis of the phenomena of consciousness; and what was not explicitly or implicitly given in a fact of consciousness, transcended the sphere of a legitimate speculation. A knowledge of the unconditioned was impossible, either immediately as a notion, or mediately as an inference. A demonstration of the absolute from the relative was logically absurd; as in such a syllogism we must collect in the conclusion what is not distributed in the premises. An immediate knowledge of the unconditioned was equally impossible: But here we think his reasoning complicated, and his reduction incomplete. We must explain ourselves.

While we regard as conclusive, Kant's analysis of time and space into mere conditions of thought, we cannot help viewing his deduction of the categories of understanding, and the ideas of speculative reason, as the work of a great but perverse ingenuity. The categories of the understanding are merely subordinate forms of the conditioned. Why not, therefore, generalize the conditioned as the one category of thought?—and if it were necessary to analyse this form into its subaltern applications, why not develop these immediately out of the generic principle, instead of preposterously, and by a forced and partial analogy, deducing the laws of the understanding from a questionable division, of logical propositions? Why distinguish Reason (*Vernunft*) from Understanding (*Verstand*), simply on the ground that the former is conversant about, or rather tends towards, the unconditioned; when it is sufficiently apparent, that the unconditioned is conceived only as the negation of the conditioned, and also that the conception of contraries is one? In the Kantian philosophy both faculties perform the same function, both seek the one in the many;—the Idea (*Idee*) is only the Conception (*Begriff*) sublimated into the inconceivable; Reason only the Understanding which has ‘overleaped itself.’ Kant has clearly shown, that the idea of the unconditioned can have no objective reality,—that it conveys no knowledge,—and that it involves the most insoluble contradictions. But he ought to have shown that the uncondi-

tioned had no objective application, because it had, in fact, no subjective affirmation,—that it afforded no real knowledge, because it contained nothing even conceivable,—and that it is self-contradictory, because it is not a notion, either simple or positive, but only a fasciculus of negations;—negations of the conditioned in its opposite extremes, and bound together merely by their common character of incomprehensibility. And while he appropriated Reason as a specific faculty to take cognisance of these negations, hypostatized as positive, under the Platonic name of *Ideas*; so also, as a pendant to his deduction of the categories of Understanding from the logical division of propositions, he deduced the classification and number of these ideas of Reason from the logical division of syllogisms. Kant thus stands intermediate between those who view the notion of the absolute as the instinctive affirmation of an encentric consciousness, and those who regard it as the factitious negative of an eccentric generalization.

Were we to adopt from the Critical Philosophy the idea of analysing thought into its fundamental conditions, and were we to carry the reduction of Kant to what we think its ultimate simplicity, we would discriminate thought into *positive* and *negative*, according as it is conversant about the conditioned or unconditioned. This, however, would constitute a logical, not a psychological distinction; as positive and negative in thought are known at once, and by the same intellectual act. The twelve categories of the understanding would be thus included under the former; the three ideas of reason under the latter; and to this intent the contrast between understanding and reason would disappear. Finally, rejecting the arbitrary limitation of time and space to the sphere of sense, we would express under the formula of—the **CONDITIONED** in **TIME** and **SPACE**—a definition of the conceivable, and an enumeration of the three categories of thought.

The imperfection and partiality of Kant's analysis are betrayed in its consequences. His doctrine leads to absolute scepticism. Speculative reason, on Kant's own admission, is an organ of mere delusion. The idea of the unconditioned, about which it is conversant, is shown to involve insoluble contradictions, and yet to be the legitimate product of intelligence. Hume has well observed, that it is of little consequence whether we possess a false reason, or no reason at all. 'If the light that leads astray 'be light from heaven,' what are we to believe? If our intellectual nature be perfidious in one revelation, it must be presumed deceitful in all; nor is it possible for Kant to establish the existence of God, freedom, and immortality, on the presumed

veracity of practical reason, after having himself disproved the credibility of speculative reason.

Kant had annihilated the older metaphysic, but the germ of a more visionary doctrine of the absolute, than any of those he had refuted, was contained in the bosom of his own philosophy. He had slain the body, but had not exorcised the spectre of the absolute; and this spectre has continued to haunt the schools of Germany even to the present day. The philosophers were not content to abandon their metaphysic; to limit philosophy to an observation of phenomena, and to the generalization of these phenomena into laws. The theories of Bouterwek, (in his earlier works,) of Bardili, of Reinhold, of Fichte, of Schelling, of Hegel, are so many endeavours, of greater or less ability, to fix the absolute as a positive in knowledge; but the absolute, like the water in the sieves of the Danaides, has always hitherto run through as a negative into the abyss of nothing.

3. Of these theories, that of Schelling is the only one in regard to which it is necessary to say any thing. His opinion constitutes the third of those we have enumerated touching the knowledge of the absolute; and the following is a brief statement of its principal positions.

While the lower sciences are of the relative and conditioned, Philosophy, as the science of sciences, must be of the absolute and unconditioned. Philosophy, therefore, supposes a science of the absolute. If the absolute is beyond our knowledge, philosophy is itself impossible.

But how, it is objected, can the absolute be known? The absolute, as unconditioned, identical, and one, cannot be known, under conditions, by difference and plurality. It cannot, therefore be known, if the subject of knowledge be distinguished from the object of knowledge; in the knowledge of the absolute, existence and knowledge must be identical; the absolute can only be known, if adequately known, by the absolute itself. But is this possible? We are wholly ignorant of existence in itself,—the mind knows nothing, except by quality, difference, and relation; consciousness supposes the subject contradistinguished from the object of thought; the abstraction of this contrast is a negation of consciousness; and the negation of consciousness is the annihilation of thought itself. The alternative is therefore unavoidable; either in finding the absolute, we lose ourselves; retaining our individual unity, we cannot reach the absolute.

All this Schelling candidly admits. He admits that a knowledge of the absolute is impossible, in a personal consciousness; he admits that, as the understanding knows, and can know, only by difference, it can conceive only the conditioned; and he ad-



mits that, only if man be himself the infinite, can the infinite be known by him :

*Nec sentire deum, nisi qui pars ipse deorum est.*

But he contends that there is a capacity of knowledge above consciousness, and higher than the understanding, and that this knowledge is competent to human reason, as identical with the absolute itself. In this act of knowledge, which, after Fichte, Schelling calls the Intellectual Intuition, there exists no distinction of subject and object,—no contrast of knowledge and existence,—all difference is lost in absolute indifference,—all plurality in absolute unity. The intuition itself—reason—and the absolute—are identical. The absolute exists only as known by reason, and reason knows only as being itself the absolute.

This act is necessarily ineffable :

The vision and the faculty divine,

to be known, must be experienced. It cannot be conceived by the understanding, because beyond its sphere ; it cannot be described, because its essence is identity, and all description supposes discrimination. To those who cannot rise beyond a philosophy of reflection, Schelling candidly allows that the doctrine of the absolute can appear only as a series of contradictions ; and he has at least the negative merit of having clearly exposed the absurdity of a philosophy of the unconditioned, as founded on a knowledge by difference, if he has utterly failed in positively proving the possibility of such a philosophy, as founded on a knowledge in identity, and through an absorption into the absolute.

Out of Laputa or the Empire it would be idle to enter into an articulate refutation of a theory which founds philosophy on the annihilation of consciousness. The intuition of the absolute is manifestly the work of an arbitrary abstraction, and of a self-delusive imagination. To reach the point of indifference by abstraction, we annihilate the object, and we annihilate the subject, of consciousness. But what remains ?—Nothing. We then hypostatize the zero ; we baptize it with the name of Absolute, and imagine that we contemplate absolute existence, when we only speculate absolute privation. This truth has been indeed virtually confessed by the two most distinguished followers of Schelling. Hegel at last abandons the intuition regarding '*pure* ' or *undetermined existence*' as convertible with '*pure nothing* ;' while Oken, if he adheres to the intuition, intrepidly identifies God or the Absolute with zero. Nor has the negative chimaera proved less fruitful than the positive ; and Schelling has found it as difficult to evolve the one into the 'many, as Oken to deduce the universe and its contents from the first self-affirmation of the '*primeval nothing*.'

Schelling has, indeed, found it impossible, without gratuitous

and even contradictory assumptions, to explain the deduction of the finite from the infinite. By no *salto mortale* has he been able to clear the magic circle in which he had enclosed himself. Unable to connect the absolute and the conditioned by any natural relation, he has variously attempted to account for the phenomenon of the universe, either by imposing a necessity of self-manifestation on the absolute, *i.e.* by conditioning the unconditioned; or by postulating a fall of the finite from the infinite, *i.e.* by begging the very phenomenon which his hypothesis professed its exclusive ability to explain. The great problem is still unresolved; and the question proposed by Orpheus at the dawn of speculation will probably remain unanswered till its decline,

Πῶς δέ μοι ἐν τι τὰ πάντ' ἔσται καὶ χωρὶς ἑκάστων;

In like manner, annihilating consciousness in order to reconstruct it, Schelling has never yet been able to connect the faculties conversant about the conditioned, with the faculty of absolute knowledge. One simple objection strikes us as decisive, although we do not remember to have seen it alleged. 'We awaken,' says Schelling, 'from the intellectual intuition as from 'the state of death, we awaken through reflection.'\* We cannot, at the same moment, be in the intellectual intuition and in common consciousness; we must therefore be able to connect them by an act of memory. But how can there be a *memory* of the absolute and its intuition? As out of time, and space, and relation, and difference, it is admitted that the absolute cannot be construed to the understanding? But as memory is only possible under the conditions of the understanding, it is consequently impossible to remember anything anterior to the moment when we awaken into consciousness; and the *clairvoyance* of the absolute, even granting its reality, is, after its conclusion, as if it had never been.

4. What we have now stated may in some degree enable the reader to apprehend the relations under which our author stands, both to those who deny and to those who admit a knowledge of the absolute. If we compare the philosophy of Cousin with the philosophy of Schelling, we at once perceive that the former is a disciple, though not a servile disciple, of the latter. But the scholar, though enamoured with his master's system as a whole, is sufficiently aware of the two insuperable difficulties of that theory. He saw, that if he pitched the absolute so high, it was impossible to deduce from it the relative; and he felt that the intellectual intuition—a stumbling-block to himself—would be

---

\* In Fichte u. Niethammer's Phil. Journ. vol. iii. p. 214.

arrant foolishness in the eyes of his countrymen. Cousin and Schelling agree, that as philosophy is the science of the unconditioned, the unconditioned must be within the compass of science. They agree that the unconditioned is known, and immediately known; and they agree that intelligence as competent to the unconditioned, is impersonal, infinite, divine. But while they coincide in the fact of the absolute as known, they are diametrically opposed as to the mode in which they attempt to realize this knowledge; each regarding, as the climax of absurdity and contradiction, the manner in which the other endeavours to bring human reason and the absolute into proportion. According to Schelling, Cousin's absolute is only a relative; according to Cousin, Schelling's knowledge of the absolute is a negation of thought itself. The latter is aware that the condition of all knowledge is plurality and difference; and the former, that the one condition, under which a knowledge of the absolute is possible, is indifference and unity. The one denies a notion of the absolute to consciousness; the other affirms that consciousness is implied in every act of intelligence. And truly we conceive that each is triumphant over the other; and the result of this mutual neutralization is, that the absolute is incognisable.

In these circumstances, it might reasonably have been expected that our author should have stated the difficulties to which his theory was exposed on one side and on the other; and endeavoured to obviate the objections, both of his brother absolutists, and of those who altogether deny a philosophy of the unconditioned. This he has not done. The possibility of reducing the notion of the absolute to a negative conception is never once supposed; and if one or two mysterious (and not always correct) allusions are made to his doctrine, the name of Schelling does not occur, we believe, in the whole compass of these lectures. Difficulties, by which either the doctrine of the absolute in general, or his own particular modification of that doctrine, may be assailed, are studiously eluded, or solved only by still greater. Assertion is substituted for argument; facts of consciousness are alleged which consciousness never knew; and paradoxes that baffle argument are promulgated as intuitive truths, above the necessity of confirmation. With every feeling of respect for M. Cousin as a man of learning and genius, we must regard the grounds on which he endeavours to establish his doctrine as erroneous, inconsequent, and assumptive. In vindicating the truth of this statement, we shall show, in the *first* place, that M. Cousin is at fault in all the authorities he quotes in favour of the opinion that the absolute, infinite, unconditioned, is a primitive notion, cognisable by the intellect; in the *second*, that his argument to prove the co-reality of his three ideas

proves directly the reverse; in the *third*, that the conditions under which alone he allows intelligence to be possible, necessarily exclude the possibility of a knowledge of the absolute; and in the *fourth*, that the absolute, as defined by him, is only a relative and a conditioned.

In the *first* place, then, M. Cousin supposes that Aristotle and Kant, in their several categories, equally proposed an analysis of the constituent elements of intelligence; and he also supposes that each, like himself, recognised among these elements the notion of the infinite or absolute. In both these suppositions he is wrong.

It is a serious error in a historian of philosophy to imagine that, in his categories, Aristotle proposed, like Kant, ‘an analysis of the elements of human reason.’ It is just, however, to mention, that in this mistake M. Cousin has been preceded by Kant himself. The ends proposed by the two philosophers were different, even opposed. In their several categories, Aristotle attempted a synthesis of things in their multiplicity,—a classification of objects real, but in relation to thought;—Kant, an analysis of mind in its unity,—a dissection of thought, pure, but in relation to its objects. The predicaments of Aristotle are thus objective, of things as understood; those of Kant subjective, of the mind as understanding. The former are results *a posteriori*—the creations of abstraction and generalisation; the latter, anticipations *a priori*—the conditions of those acts themselves. It is true, that as the one scheme exhibits the unity of thought diverging into plurality, in appliance to its objects, and as the other exhibits the multiplicity of these objects converging towards unity by the collective determination of thought; while, at the same time, language usually confounds the subjective and objective under a common term;—it is certainly true, that some elements in the one table coincide in name with some elements in the other. This coincidence is, however, only equivocal. In reality, the whole Kantian categories must be excluded from the Aristotelic list, as *entia rationis*, as *notiones secundæ*—in short, as determinations of thought, and not genera of real things; while the several elements would be specially excluded, as *partial*, *privative*, *transcendent*, &c. But if it would be unjust to criticise the categories of Kant in whole, or in part, by the Aristotelic canon, what must we think of Kant, who, after magnifying the idea of investigating the forms of pure intellect as worthy of the mighty genius of the Stagyræ, proceeds on this false hypothesis to blame the execution as rhapsodic, as incomplete, as confounding derivative with simple notions; nay, even on the narrow principles of his own *Critique*, as mixing the forms of

pure sense with the forms of pure understanding? \* If M. Cousin were correct in his supposition that Aristotle and his followers had viewed his categories as an analysis of the regulative forms of thought, he would find his own reduction of the elements of reason to a double principle anticipated in the scholastic division of existence into *ens per se* and *ens per accidens*.

Nor is our author correct in thinking that the categories of Aristotle and Kant are complete, inasmuch as they are co-extensive with his own. As to the former, if the infinite were not excluded, on what would rest the scholastic distinction of *ens categoricum* and *ens transcendens*? The logicians require that predicamental matter shall be of a limited and finite nature: God, as infinite, is thus excluded; and as it is evident from the whole context of his book of categories, that Aristotle there only contemplated a distribution of the finite, so, in other works, he more than once emphatically denies the infinite as an object not only of knowledge, but of thought:—τὸ ἀπείρουν ἀγνώστον ἢ ἀπείρουν—τὸ ἀπείρουν οὔτε νοητόν, οὔτε αἰσθητόν.† And while Aristotle thus regards the infinite as beyond the compass of thought, Kant views it as at least beyond the sphere of knowledge. If M. Cousin indeed employed the term category in relation to the Kantian philosophy in the Kantian acceptation, he would be as erroneous in regard to Kant as he is in regard to Aristotle; but we presume that he wishes, under that term, to include not only the ‘Categories of Understanding,’ but the ‘Ideas of Reason.’ Kant limits knowledge to experience, and experience to the categories of the understanding, which, in reality, are only so many forms of the conditioned; and allows to the notion of the unconditioned (corresponding to the ideas of reason) no objective reality, regarding it merely as a regulative principle in the arrangement of our thoughts. M. Cousin is thus totally wrong in regard to the one, and wrong in part in relation to the other.

In the *second* place, our author asserts that the idea of the infinite, the absolute, &c., and the idea of the finite, the conditioned, &c., are equally real, because the notion of the one necessarily suggests the conception of the other.

Correlatives certainly suggest each other, but correlatives may, or may not, be equally real and positive. Contradictories necessarily imply each other, for the knowledge of contraries is one. But the reality of one contradictory, so far from guaran-

\* See the *Kritik* d. R. V. and the *Prolegomena*.

† *Phys.* L. iii. c. 10, text. 66, c. 7, text. 40. See also *Metaph.* L. ii. c. 2, text. 11. *Analyt. Post.* L. i. c. 20, text. 39—et alibi.

teeing the reality of the other, is nothing else than its negation. Thus every positive notion (the knowledge of a thing by what it is) suggests a negative notion (the knowledge of a thing by what it is not); and the highest positive notion, the notion of the conceivable, is not without its corresponding negative in the notion of the inconceivable. But though these mutually suggest each other, the positive alone is real; the negative is only an abstraction of the other, and in the highest generalisation is even an abstraction of thought itself. It therefore behoved M. Cousin, instead of assuming the co-reality of his two elements on the fact of their correlation, to have suspected, on this very ground, that the reality of the one was inconsistent with the reality of the other. In fact, upon examination, it will be found that his two primitive ideas are nothing more than contradictory relatives. These, consequently, of their very nature, imply each other; but they imply each other only as affirmation and negation of the same.

We have already shown, that though the conditioned (conditionally limited) be one, what is opposed to it as the unconditioned, is plural; that the unconditional negation of limitation gives one unconditioned, the infinite; while the unconditional affirmation of limitation affords another, the absolute. And this coincides with the opinion, that the unconditioned is positively inconceivable. But those who, with M. Cousin, regard the notion of the unconditioned as a positive and real knowledge of existence in its all-comprehensive unity, and who consequently employ the terms absolute, infinite, unconditioned, as only various expressions for the same identity, are bound to prove that their idea of unity corresponds—either with that unconditioned we have distinguished as the absolute,—or with that unconditioned we have distinguished as the infinite,—or that it includes both,—or that it excludes both. This they have not done, and, we suspect, have never attempted to do.

Our author maintains, that the unconditioned is known under the laws of consciousness; and does not, like Schelling, pretend to an intuition of existence beyond the bounds of space and time. Indeed, he himself expressly predicates the absolute and infinite of these forms. But is the absolute conceivable of time? Can we conceive time as unconditionally limited? We can easily represent to ourselves time under any relative limitation of commencement and termination; but we are conscious to ourselves of nothing more clearly, than that it would be equally possible to think without thought, as to construe to the mind an absolute commencement, or an absolute termination, of time; that is, a beginning and an end, beyond which, time is conceived as non-

existent. Stretch imagination to the utmost, it still sinks paralysed within the bounds of time, and time survives as the condition of the thought itself in which we annihilate the universe :

‘ Sur les mondes détruits le Temps dort immobile.’

But if the absolute is inconceivable of this form, is the infinite more comprehensible? Can we imagine time as unconditionally unlimited? We cannot conceive the infinite regress of time; for such a notion could only be realized by the infinite addition in thought of finite times, and such an addition would, itself, require an eternity for its accomplishment. If we dream of effecting this, we only deceive ourselves by substituting the *indefinite* for the infinite, than which no two notions can be more opposed. The negation of a commencement of time involves likewise the affirmation, that an infinite time has at every moment already run; that is, it implies the contradiction, that an infinite has been completed. For the same reasons we are unable to conceive an infinite progress of time; while the infinite regress and the infinite progress, taken together, involve the triple contradiction of an infinite concluded, of an infinite commencing, and of two infinities, not exclusive of each other. Thought is equally powerless in realizing a conception either of the absolute totality, or of the infinite immensity, of space. And, as time and space, as wholes, can thus neither be conceived as absolutely limited, nor as infinitely unlimited; so their parts can be represented to the mind neither as absolutely individual, nor as divisible to infinity. The universe cannot be imagined as a whole, that may not also be imagined as a part; nor an atom be imagined as a part, that may not also be imagined as a whole. The same analysis, with a similar result, may be applied to cause and effect, and to substance and phenomenon. These, however, may both be reduced to the law of the conditioned.

The conditioned is, therefore, that only which can be positively conceived; the absolute and infinite are conceived only as negations of the conditioned in its opposite poles.

Now, as we observed, M. Cousin, and those who confound the absolute and infinite, and regard the unconditioned as a positive and indivisible notion, must show that this notion coincides either, 1st, with the notion of the absolute, to the exclusion of the infinite; or 2d, with the notion of the infinite to the exclusion of the absolute; or 3d, that it includes both as true, carrying them up to indifference; or 4th, that it excludes both as false. The last two alternatives are impossible, as either would be subversive of the highest principle of reason, which asserts,

that of two contradictories, both cannot, but one must, be true. It only, therefore, remains to identify the unity of the unconditioned with the infinite, or with the absolute—with either, to the exclusion of the other. But while every one must be intimately conscious of the impossibility of this, the very fact that our author and other philosophers *a priori* have constantly found it necessary to confound these contradictions, sufficiently proves that neither term has a right to represent the unity of the unconditioned, to the prejudice of the other.

The unconditioned is, therefore, not a positive conception; nor has it even a real or intrinsic unity; for it only combines the absolute and the infinite, contradictory in themselves, into a unity *relative to us* by the negative bond of their inconceivability. It is on this mistake of the relative for the intrinsic, of the negative for the positive, that M. Cousin's theory is founded: And it is not difficult to understand how the mistake originated.

This reduction of M. Cousin's two ideas of the infinite and finite into one positive conception and its negative, implicitly annihilates also the *third* idea, devised by him as a connexion between his two substantive ideas; and which he marvellously identifies with the relation of cause and effect. Before leaving this part of our subject, we may observe, that the very simplicity of our analysis is a presumption in favour of its truth. A plurality of causes is not to be postulated, where one is sufficient to account for the phenomena: *entia non sunt multiplicanda præter necessitatem*. And M. Cousin, in supposing three positive ideas, where only one is necessary, arrays every rule of philosophy against his hypothesis, even before its unsoundness is definitely brought to light.

In the *third* place, the restrictions to which our author subjects intelligence, divine and human, implicitly deny a knowledge of the absolute, both to God and man. 'The condition of intelligence,' says Cousin, 'is difference; and an act of knowledge is only possible where there exists a *plurality of terms*. Unity does not suffice for conception; variety is necessary; nay more, not only is variety necessary, there must likewise subsist an intimate relation between the principles of unity and variety; without which, the variety not being perceived by the unity, the one is as if it could not perceive, and the other, as if it could not be perceived. Look back for a moment into yourselves, and you will find, that what constitutes intelligence in our feeble consciousness, is, that there are there several terms, of which the one perceives the other, of which the other is perceived by the first: in this consists self-knowledge,—in this consists self-comprehension,—in this con-



‘sists intelligence : intelligence without consciousness is the  
 ‘ abstract possibility of intelligence, not intelligence in the act ;  
 ‘ and consciousness implies diversity and difference. Transfer  
 ‘ all this from human to absolute intelligence—that is to say,  
 ‘ refer the ideas to the only intelligence to which they can belong  
 ‘ —you have thus, if I may so express myself, the life of ab-  
 ‘ solute intelligence ; you have this intelligence with the complete  
 ‘ developement of the elements which are necessary for it to be  
 ‘ a true intelligence ; you have all the *momenta* whose relation  
 ‘ and motion constitute the reality of knowledge.’ In all this,  
 so far as human intelligence is concerned, we cordially agree ;  
 or a more complete admission could not be imagined, not only  
 that a knowledge of the absolute is impossible for man, but that  
 we are unable to conceive the possibility of such a knowledge,  
 even in the Deity, without contradicting our human conceptions  
 of the possibility of intelligence itself. Our author, however,  
 perceives no contradiction ; and, without argument or explana-  
 tion, accords a knowledge of that which can only be known  
 under the negation of all difference and plurality, to that which  
 can only know under the affirmation of both.

If a knowledge of the absolute were possible under these conditions, it may excite our wonder that other philosophers should have viewed the supposition as the merest absurdity ; and that Schelling, whose acuteness was never questioned, should have exposed himself gratuitously to the reproach of mysticism by his postulating for a few, and through a faculty above the reach of consciousness, a knowledge already given to all in the fact of consciousness itself. Monstrous as is the postulate of the intellectual intuition, we freely confess that it is only through such a faculty that we can imagine the possibility of a science of the absolute ; and have no hesitation in acknowledging, that if Schelling's hypothesis appear to us indemonstrable, that of Cousin is seen to be self-contradictory.

Our author admits, and must admit, that the absolute is absolutely one : and absolute unity is convertible with the absolute negation of plurality and difference : the absolute, and the knowledge of the absolute, are therefore identical. But knowledge, or intelligence, it is asserted by M. Cousin, supposes a plurality of terms—the plurality of subject and object. Intelligence, whose essence is plurality, cannot therefore be identified with the absolute, whose essence is unity ; and if known, the absolute, as known, must be different from the absolute, as existing ; that is, there must be two absolutes—an absolute in knowledge, and an absolute in existence, which is doubly contradictory.

But waiving this contradiction, and allowing the non-identity

of knowledge and existence, the absolute as known must be known under the conditions of the absolute as existing, that is, as absolute unity. But, on the other hand, it is asserted, that the condition of intelligence as knowing, is plurality and difference; consequently the condition of the absolute as existing, and under which it must be known, and the condition of intelligence as capable of knowing, are incompatible. For, if we suppose the absolute cognisable, it must be identified either, *First*, with the subject; or, *Second*, with the object of intelligence; or, *Third*, with the indifference of both. The first hypothesis, and the second, are contradictory of that of the absolute; for in these the absolute is supposed to be known, either as contradistinguishing from the subject, or as contradistinguishing from the object, of thought; in other words, it is asserted to be known as absolute unity, *i. e.* as the negation of all plurality, while the very act by which it is known, affirms plurality as the condition of knowledge itself. The third hypothesis, on the other hand, is contradictory of the plurality of intelligence; for if the subject and the object of consciousness be known as one, a plurality of terms is not the necessary condition of intelligence. The alternative is therefore necessary; either the absolute cannot be known at all, or our author is wrong in subjecting thought to the conditions of plurality and difference. It was the iron necessity of the alternative that constrained Schelling to resort to the hypothesis of a knowledge in identity through the intellectual intuition; and it could only be from an oversight of the main difficulties of the problem that M. Cousin, in abandoning the intellectual intuition, did not abandon the absolute itself. For how that whose essence is all-comprehensive unity, can be known by the negation of that unity under the condition of plurality;—how that which exists only as the identity of all difference can be known under the negation of that identity in the antithesis of subject and object, of knowledge and of existence,—these are contradictions which M. Cousin has not attempted to solve;—contradictions which he has not even ventured to state.

In the *fourth* place.—The objection of the inconceivable nature of Schelling's intellectual intuition, and of a knowledge of the absolute in identity, apparently determined our author to adopt the opposite, but suicidal alternative, of a knowledge of the absolute in consciousness, and by difference. The equally insuperable objection, that from the absolute defined as absolute, Schelling had not been able, without inconsequence, to deduce the conditioned, seems in like manner to have influenced M. Cousin to define the absolute by a relative; not aware, it would appear, that though he thus facilitated the derivation of the con-

ditioned, he annihilated in reality the absolute itself. By the former proceeding, our author virtually denies the possibility of the absolute in knowledge; by the latter, the possibility of the absolute in existence.

The absolute is defined by our author 'an absolute cause—a cause which cannot but pass into act.' Now, it is sufficiently manifest that a thing existing absolutely, (*i. e.* not under relation,) and a thing existing absolutely as a cause, are contradictory. The former is the absolute negation of all relation, the latter is the absolute affirmation of a particular relation. A cause is a relative, and what exists absolutely as a cause, exists absolutely under relation. Schelling has justly observed, that 'he would deviate as wide as the poles from the idea of the absolute, who would think of defining its nature by the notion of activity.'\* But he who would define the absolute by the notion of a cause, would deviate still more widely from its nature; inasmuch as the notion of a cause involves not only the notion of a determination to activity, but of a determination to a dependent kind of activity—an activity not immanent, but transient. What exists merely as a cause, exists merely for the sake of something else,—is not final in itself, but simply a mean towards an end; and in the accomplishment of that end, it consummates its own perfection. Abstractly considered, the effect is therefore superior to the cause. A cause, as cause, may indeed be better than any given number of its effects; but the total complement of the effects of what exists only as a cause, is better than that which, *ex hypothesi*, exists only for the sake of their production. But an absolute cause is not only dependent on the effect for its *perfection*—it is dependent on it even for its *reality*. For to what extent a thing exists necessarily as a cause, to that extent it is not all-sufficient to itself; for to that extent it is dependent on the effect, as on the condition through which alone it realizes its existence; and what exists absolutely as a cause, exists therefore in absolute dependence on the effect for the reality of its existence. An absolute cause, in truth, only exists in its effects: it never *is*, it always *becomes*.

The definition of the absolute by absolute cause is, therefore, tantamount to a negation of itself; for it defines by relation and conditions, ~~that~~ which is conceived only as exclusive of both. The same is true of the definition of the absolute by substance.

The vice of M. Cousin's definition of the absolute by absolute cause, is manifested likewise in its applications. Our author

---

\* Bruno, p. 171.

vaunts that his theory can alone explain the nature and relations of the Deity; and on its absolute incompetency to fulfil the conditions of a rational theism, we are willing to rest a demonstration of its futility.

'God,' says our author, 'creates; he creates in virtue of his creative power, and he draws the universe, not from nonentity, but from himself, who is absolute existence. His distinguishing characteristic being an absolute creative force, which cannot but pass into activity, it follows, not that the creation is possible, but that it is necessary.'

We must be very brief. The subjection of the Deity to a necessity—a necessity of self-manifestation identical with the creation of the universe, is contradictory of the fundamental postulates of a divine nature. On this hypothesis, God is not distinct from the world; the creature is a modification of the creator. Now, without objecting that the simple subordination of the Deity to necessity, is in itself tantamount to his dethronement, let us see to what consequences this necessity, on the hypothesis of our author, inevitably leads. On this hypothesis, one of two alternatives must be admitted. God, as necessarily determined to pass from absolute essence to relative manifestation, is determined to pass either from the better to the worse, or from the worse to the better. A third possibility, that both states are equal, as contradictory in itself, and as contradicted by our author, it is not necessary to consider.

The first supposition must be rejected. The necessity in this case determines God to pass from the better to the worse; that is, operates to his partial annihilation. The force which compels this must be external and hostile, for nothing operates to its own deterioration; and, as superior to the pretended God, is either itself the real deity, if an intelligent cause, or a negation of all deity, if a blind force or fate.

The second is equally inadmissible—that God, passing into the universe, passes from a state of comparative imperfection, into a state of comparative perfection. The divine nature is identical with the most perfect nature, and is also identical with the first cause. If the first cause be not identical with the most perfect nature, there is no God, for the two essential conditions of his existence are not in combination. Now, on the present supposition, the most perfect nature is the derived; that is, the universe in relation to its cause, is the real, the actual, the *ὄντως ὄν*. It would also be the divine, but that divinity supposes also the notion of cause, while the universe, *ex hypothesi*, is only an effect.

It is no answer to these difficulties for M. Cousin to say, that

the Deity, though a cause which cannot choose but create, is not however exhausted in the act; and though passing with all the elements of his being into the universe, that he remains entire in his essence, and with all the superiority of the cause over the effect. The dilemma is unavoidable—either the Deity is independent of the universe for his being or his perfection; on which alternative our author must abandon his theory of God and the creation: Or the Deity is dependent on his manifestation in the universe for his existence or his perfection; on which alternative, his doctrine is assailed by the difficulties previously stated.

The length to which the preceding observations have extended, prevents us from adverting to many other opinions of our author, which we conceive to be equally unfounded. For example, to say nothing of his proof of the impersonality of intelligence, because, forsooth, truth is not subject to our will, what can be conceived more self-contradictory than his theory of liberty? Divorcing liberty from intelligence, but connecting it with personality, he defines it to be a cause which is determined to act only by its proper energy. But (to say nothing of remoter difficulties) how liberty can be conceived (supposing always a plurality of modes of activity) without a knowledge of that plurality,—how a faculty can resolve to act by preference in a particular manner, and not determine itself by final causes,—how intelligence can influence a blind power without operating as an efficient cause—or how, in fine, morality can be founded on a liberty which, at best, only escapes necessity by taking refuge with chance—these are problems which M. Cousin, in none of his works, has stated, and which we are confident he is unable to solve.

After the tenor of our previous observations, it is needless to say that we regard M. Cousin's attempt to establish a general peace among philosophers, by the promulgation of his Eclectic Theory, as a signal failure. But though no converts to his philosophy, and viewing with regret what we must regard as the misapplication of his distinguished talents, we cannot disown a strong feeling of interest and admiration for those qualities, even in their excess, which have betrayed him, with so many other aspiring philosophers, into a pursuit which could end only in disappointment—we mean his love of truth, and his reliance on the powers of man. Not to despair of philosophy is a 'last infirmity of noble minds.' The stronger the intellect, the stronger the confidence in its force: the more ardent the appetite for knowledge, the less are we prepared to canvass the uncertainty of the conclusion. 'The wish is parent to the thought.' Loath to admit that our science is at best the reflection of a reality we

cannot know, we strive to penetrate to existence in itself; and what we have laboured intensely to attain, we at last fondly believe we have accomplished. But, like Ixion, we embrace a cloud for a divinity. Conscious only of limitation, we think to comprehend the infinite, and dream of establishing our human science on an identity with the omniscient God. It is this powerful tendency of the most vigorous minds to transcend the sphere of our faculties, that makes a 'learned ignorance' the most difficult acquirement of knowledge. In the words of a forgotten, but acute philosopher,—*magna, immo maxima, pars sapientiæ, est quædam æquo animo nescire velle.*

---

ART. XII.—*Narrative of an Ascent to the Summit of Mont Blanc, on the 8th and 9th August 1827.* By JOHN AULDJO, Esq. of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: 1828.

WE feel extremely reluctant to state in words the observations which must, we think, suggest themselves to every person of reflection, upon perusing this narrative; because we are aware they may wear an invidious aspect, and seem to show very little gratitude for the pleasure which the perusal has, no doubt, given. Nevertheless, we consider Mr Auldjo's as one of a great number of cases, requiring some comment; and good may arise from a little calm and respectful expostulation.

The ascent of Mont Blanc, the highest mountain in Europe, indeed in the Old World, being about three miles perpendicular above the level of the sea, was, when first undertaken for scientific purposes, an object eminently praiseworthy; and the accomplishment of it, through very great toil and dangers, justly entitled Paccard and Saussure to gratitude and admiration, not to be merely measured by the real value of the additions resulting from it to the sum of human knowledge. Nor would any one hesitate to bestow similar applause on others who might follow in the same track, with the view of repeating or varying the observations of those philosophers; because the sufferings to be endured are as great, and the risks to be encountered not much less now than they were to the first adventurers. But to climb the mountain merely for the sake of a view, and undergo all the toil, and pass through all the dangers of the expedition, only that you may have it to boast of, deserves very little commendation at the hands of the most lenient judges; while those who look more narrowly at the matter will be led to condemn the proceeding altogether.

He who would reach the summit of Mont Blanc, has, very early in his journey, to make his way along a path cut upon the face of a cliff, sometimes perpendicular, and sometimes overhanging, several hundred feet in height, so narrow, that he must frequently walk sideways, in order to keep his balance; and this is one of the least perilous portions of the expedition. He soon meets with abysses, which can only be crossed by laying a few poles over, and walking or sliding upon them. Others he must pass, so broad, that he can only get over upon natural bridges of snow; and as the snow frequently is too thin to bear the weight of a person walking, one crawls over, and the others are drawn by ropes. In one place a huge block of ice is in the way, and lies upon a crevice so deep, that the eye cannot see to the bottom. Upon the perpendicular side of this block, steps are cut with a hatchet, and by means of these the adventurous traveller, in quest of amusement, reaches the other side, should he be fortunate enough to escape without slipping. Sometimes, in clambering up the sides of the glacier, the feet give way, and he rolls and slides to the very edge of the precipice, before the guide, to whom he is attached by a rope, can venture to stop him; lest he should, on his own insecure footing, be moved by the effort, and be dragged after him over the brink. An avalanche is so frequent, that, in the course of the journey, it is many chances to one that he should be buried under it. The latter part of the ascent, from the rarified state of the air, with the fatigue of climbing, makes the bursting of a blood-vessel extremely likely, and is sure to prove fatal if there be any hidden defect in the chest or head. The dangers of the return are considerably increased by the great difficulty of keeping the head steady in descending, and of using the limbs under the effects of exhaustion. The reward of the whole is a view from a height far too great to make any object discernible, and the being able to say you have done what very few besides ever did, and what you had much better have left undone.

We have said nothing all the while of the mere sufferings, independent of danger,—the extreme fatigue, the pains in the head, and lungs, and limbs—the excessive cold—the annoyance from cutting winds, and sleet, and rain—the severe inflictions of thirst and loss of strength. All this, endured in his own person, is the price paid by the traveller for his boast; and endured by his guides, is the purchase which he makes with his money. He has a perfect right to suffer in this way himself, and to bribe others to suffer with him, so long as it is only pain and privation. But has a man a right to expose his own life, and the lives of others, for an object of no earthly value either to

himself or to his fellow-creatures? If life is lost in the adventure, how little does the moral guilt differ from that of suicide or murder? There is nothing more worthy of a man, nothing by which the applause of the world is more severely, or more justly earned, than in steadily meeting great dangers for the attainment of some adequate object,—some good to another, some benefit to mankind. But there is not a more senseless act, or one deserving less respect, even if it were justifiable, than encountering danger for the mere love of it, and without an object. Besides, if a man is of this humour, he may gratify it far more easily, and at much less expense, than by climbing in the Alps. There is not a house, certainly not a steeple, in any part of the country, which does not afford as great facilities as the *Pierre Pointere*. A run along the parapet of a bridge, after a fall of sleet, sounds less magnificent, but in real substantial danger, may vie with the worst adventure in all Mr Auldjo's journal. And so the wise folks, who practise in this line upon Mount Vesuvius, might find just as good opportunities of displaying their contempt of danger and common sense, at the next lime-kiln, or blacksmith's forge, or even without going further than their own kitchen fire.

Is it not worth considering that Mr Auldjo might have rescued many a drowning man from destruction at less hazard to his own life than he passed through during almost any one hour of his journey up and down the mountain? But is it not also to be considered, that had he thrown away his own life upon this occasion, his country would have lost an active, enterprising young man, capable of proving a useful citizen, and his family would have been plunged in grief? To set against the evils of a failure, there is no one benefit resulting from the most complete success. Some thirty or forty years ago, the happiness of two amiable and respectable families in England was destroyed, by their apparent heirs being drowned in attempting to sail down a fall, or rapid, in the Rhine. Their only reason for making the attempt was exactly that, which, in the absence of all other motives, ought to have prevented them from thinking of it—that the thing had never been done before. Such motives are constantly operating, in various ways, upon very thoughtless people;—the consequences are often fatal, and frequently highly pernicious, even where no lives are lost.

It may be said that we are too severe in this condemnation; that those who thus sport with their lives, do so with no design whatever to throw them away; and that, at all events, it is their own affair, the stake being peculiarly theirs. We readily admit that there is no determination to lose in such adventures, any



more than in other kinds of gambling, where men stake their fortune and not their lives, with the hope of winning other men's money at the hazard of losing their own;—a speculation beyond all comparison more rational and less criminal, bad as it is reckoned by every sound moralist. But surely the mere absence of a positive intention in a man to kill himself, does not materially vary the case; unless we mean also to acquit him of murder, who, firing blindfolded into the street, kills a passenger whom he never heard of, and could not suspect to be near. Life is intrusted to us for other purposes than to be so trifled with. It is a mere figure of speech to call it our own, in the sense of being entitled to do as we please with it. No one is so insulated that his death may not injure some other; and no extreme case of isolation can be so put, that another might not equally be figured to justify hazarding the lives of others. Indeed, it is remarkable that the kind of expeditions which have drawn forth these remarks, affords an example of this also. The rich Englishman not only exposes his own life to risk, but he hires some half-dozen of guides to expose theirs along with him. How far this is relished by their wives and families, is very candidly related to us by our author. Some who had engaged to go, drew back, overcome by the entreaties of their relatives. Their place was supplied by others, and of these some, in like manner, were prevailed upon to desert. When, at length, the 'complement was obtained, and the hour fixed for setting out arrived, I could not,' says Mr Auldjo, 'get them together at the time; most of them had to part from their wives and relations. When they did join us, it was with a *cortege*, some crying, some upbraiding us with tempting those who formed their only support, to sacrifice themselves to my curiosity and pleasure; many a bitter tear flowed, and more than one heart waxed heavy on the morning of the 8th: two or three of my countrymen were kind enough to accompany me through the weeping crowd assembled,' &c.—(P. 9.) It seems, however, that the mere hire is not the only inducement which leads these poor people to run such risks. The folly of idle travellers, and especially of women, urges them on. 'The first question generally asked by the visitors of all nations, and invariably by the fair sex, is, Have you been up the mountain? They all know the value of the recommendation, if they have been, and with great pride answer in the affirmative; those who have not, reply dejectedly.' In short, it is plain that those who have been up, are on all occasions preferred, in their ordinary vocation of guides, especially by those silly women who, taking good care to run no risks themselves, thus hold out encouragement, by

their senseless babble, to make as many fathers of families as they can lose their lives, for absolutely nothing. We should not envy one of those 'fair sex' interrogators her feelings, the day after Dr Hamel's three guides perished in ascending the mountain; some of them having, possibly the week before, been asked the usual question, and 'replied, dejectedly,' in the negative.

With the formation of the plan itself, however, our disapprobation of Mr Auldjo ends. He merits no little admiration for the courage and constancy which he displays in executing it; and we are forced to admit, that, had there been any adequate motive for so much endurance, he would have claimed a high rank among adventurous travellers. His narrative, too, is sufficiently minute and interesting to keep up the attention, notwithstanding the somewhat uniform nature of the details.

The first point which the travellers aim at is the *Grands Mûlets*, two sharp rocks which form the summits of a precipice three hundred feet in height on one side, but not a hundred feet above the surface of the glacier on the other. About three-fourths from this latter base, there is a narrow platform, upon which it is necessary to encamp, in order to avoid the danger of avalanches in the night. To reach this halting-place was a matter of some difficulty.

'Arriving near the base of those rocks called the "Grands Mûlets," we found that a chasm of eighty feet in width separated them from us. We proceeded up an acclivity forming a narrow neck of ice, but at its termination a wall opposed us: on either hand yawned a wide and deep crevice, and it appeared that there was no advancing without climbing this perpendicular mass of twenty feet in height. The neck we were standing upon overhung a gulf formed by the chasm and crevices, the very sight of which was appalling. The wall met this neck with an angle formed by these two crevices, which continued on each side of it, the angle coming to a most acute and delicate point. No time was to be lost: we were standing in a very perilous situation, and Coutet commenced cutting steps on the angle with his hatchet, and after great labour, and considerable danger, in the execution of his purpose, got to the top, and was immediately followed by another guide. The knapsacks were then drawn up, and the rest of the party after them. In ascending this wall, being partly drawn up, partly clambering, I stopped for an instant and looked down into the abyss beneath me: the blood curdled in my veins, for never did I behold any thing so terrific. I have endeavoured, in a sketch which the singularity and peril of our position induced me to take, and from which Mr Harding has been able to make a very interesting drawing, to represent the scaling of this wall. The great beauty of the immense crevices around us excited not only my admiration, but even that of the guides, accustomed as they were to such scenes.

'Safely on the top, on looking around, we discovered that these large crevices extended on each side to a very great distance, the plane of the wall sloping from the upper to the lower crevice with an inclination which rendered walking on it very perilous. Some proposed to return to the commencement of the neck of ice which we had passed, and making a circuit from it, to get to the base of the "Grands Mulôts," on the other side of the great crevice, and climb up the rock: others were for proceeding, and their advice was followed. Walking with the greatest caution, in steps cut with the hatchet, we moved on very slowly; the ice was slippery, and a false step might have endangered the life of more than one individual. The wall now widened, but the slope became more inclined. Taking my steps with the greatest care, I could not prevent myself from slipping; as the space became wider I became less cautious, and while looking over the edge into the upper crevice, my feet slid from under me; I came down on my face, and glided rapidly towards the lower one; I cried out, but the guides who held the ropes attached to me did not stop me, though they stood firm. I had got to the extent of the rope, my feet hanging over the lower crevice, one hand grasping firmly the pole, and the other my hat. The guides called to me to be cool, and not afraid;—a pretty time to be cool, hanging over an abyss, and in momentary expectation of falling into it! They made no attempt to pull me up for some moments, and then desiring me to raise myself, they drew in the rope until I was close to them and in safety.

'The reason for this proceeding is obvious. Had they attempted, on the bad and uncertain footing in which they stood, to check me at the first gliding, they might have lost their own balance, and our destruction would have followed; but by fixing themselves firmly in the cut step, and securing themselves with their batons, they were enabled to support me with certainty when the rope had gone its length. This also gave me time to recover, that I might assist them in placing myself out of danger; for it is not to be supposed that, in such a situation, I did not lose, in a great degree, my presence of mind. These were good reasons, no doubt; but placed as I was, in such imminent peril, I could not have allowed them to be so.'

Having reached the Grand Mulôts, and clambered up to the ledge, they found it about five feet wide, and twelve in length. Here, within about two feet of the steep side towards Chamouni, (which M. Auldjo always calls Chamonix,) they lit a fire, changed their clothes, cooked and ate their dinner, and then slept under a kind of awning, formed by throwing a sheet over their poles, placed aslant against the rock. Soon after three in the morning they continued their journey, suffering extremely from the cold, and the pain of walking upon a slippery surface. About seven they came to a frightful chasm, across which was a bridge of snow, strong enough to bear them, and so hollow as to afford shelter from the wind, whose piercing cold had occasioned great suffering. Here, therefore, they stopped to breakfast.

' While breakfast was preparing, I could not resist the temptation of wandering along the edge of the crevice, on the Plateau side. The depth of it was immense, its great breadth affording me an opportunity of a more accurate and perfect examination than I had had before. The layers of ice forming the glacier, varying in colour from deep blueish-green to a silvery whiteness, with myriads of long clear icicles hanging from all the little breaks in the strata, presented a scene of the greatest beauty. From this point I had a view immediately under our bridge: the manner in which it hung suspended, with all the guides sitting on it, many hundred feet from the bottom of this stupendous chasm, was a beautiful and curious, but at the same time an appalling sight. In one moment, without a chance of escape, the fall of the bridge might have precipitated them into the gulf beneath. Yet no such idea ever entered the imagination of my thoughtless but brave guides, who sat at their meal singing and laughing, either unconscious or regardless of the danger of their present situation.

' We crossed a plain of snow which rose gently from the Rochers Rouges; at the end of it was the only crevice we had met for some time: it was deep and wide. One bridge was tried, but it gave way; a little further another was found, over which we managed to pass by being drawn across on our backs, on batons placed over it. Two or three managed to walk across another, using great care; but, when we had proceeded some little distance up the acclivity before us, we were surprised by a shrill scream, and on turning beheld Jean Marie Coutet up to his neck in the snow covering the crevice. He had wandered from the party, and coming to the crack, sought and found the place where the guides had walked across, and attempted to follow their course, but not taking the proper care to choose their footsteps, had got about eighteen inches on one side of them; and the consequence was, that when in the centre of the crevice, he sunk up to his shoulders, saving himself from inevitable destruction by stretching out his arms, and by his baton by mere chance coming obliquely on the bridge, otherwise he would have slipped through, and all attempts to have saved or raised him out of the chasm would have been impossible. The perilous situation he was in was appalling: all ran down to him, and he was drawn out, but had nearly lost his presence of mind, so greatly had he been terrified. However, he soon recovered, and acknowledged his want of precaution, which had very nearly destroyed the pleasure of the undertaking, when so near its happy conclusion.'

When within an hour of the summit, Mr Auldjo was attacked with such shortness of breathing from the thinness of the air, and suffered so much from the languor, drowsiness, and dejection occasioned by the cold and fatigue, that he could hardly be persuaded to go on. Every three or four steps, they were obliged to stop and take breath; the strongest guide was forced to turn round, and by exposing himself to the strong north wind, regain strength enough to take a few steps more. The following

passage gives a lively picture of the state in which he at last reached the summit :—

‘ Although the sun was shining on us, I felt extremely cold on the side exposed to the cutting blast; and the other side of the body being warm, it increased the shivering, which had not quite left me, to such a degree as to deprive me almost of the use of my limbs. Some of the guides, also, were similarly affected, and even suffered more than myself; but all were anxious to get on, evincing a resolute determination that was quite wonderful in the state they were in. Their attention to me was marked by a desire to render me every possible service, while they endeavoured to inspire me with the same firmness of which they themselves gave so strong an example. This earnest solicitude which they showed, much to their own discomfort and annoyance, to keep my spirits up, was in vain: I was exhausted; the sensation of weakness in the legs had become excessive; I was nearly choking from the dryness of my throat and the difficulty of breathing. My eyes were smarting with inflammation, the reflection from the snow nearly blinding me, at the same time burning and blistering my face. I had, during the morning, as a protection, occasionally worn a leather mask, with green eye-glasses, but latterly I found it oppressive, and wore a veil instead; that, also, I was now obliged to discard. I desired to have a few moments’ rest, and sat down; I besought the guides to leave me; I prayed Julien Devouassoud to go to the summit with them, and allow me to remain where I was, that by the time they returned I might be refreshed to commence the descent. I told them I had seen enough; I used every argument in my power to induce them to grant my request. Their only answer was, that they would carry me, exhausted as they were, to the summit, rather than that I should not get to it; that if they could not carry, they would drag me.

‘ Being unable to resist, I became passive, and two of the least exhausted forced me up some short distance, each taking an arm. I found that this eased me, and I then went on more willingly; when one of them devised a plan which proved of most essential service: Two of them went up in advance about fourteen paces, and fixed themselves on the snow; a long rope was fastened round my chest, and the other end to them; as soon as they were seated, I commenced ascending, taking very long strides, and doing so with quickness, pulling the rope in; they also, while I thus exerted myself, pulled me towards them; so that I was partly drawn up, and partly ran up, using a zig-zag direction; and the amusement derived from the process kept us in better humour than we were before. I was less fatigued, and felt the effects of the air less, by this process, than by the slow pace in which I had hitherto attempted to ascend.

‘ I had taken very little notice of the progress we were thus making, when I suddenly found myself on the summit! I hastened to the highest point, (towards Chamonix,) and, taking my glass, observed that the party on the Breven had noticed the accomplishment of our undertaking, and were rewarding us by waving their hats and handkerchiefs, which salutation we returned. I noticed, also, that the people in Cha-

monix had also collected in considerable numbers on the bridge, watching our progress and success. It was exactly eleven o'clock.

'The wind blew with considerable force. I was too much worn out to remain there long, or to examine the scene around me. The sun shone brilliantly on every peak of snow that I could see; hardly any mist hung over the valleys; none was on the mountains; the object of my ambition and my toil was gained; yet the reward of my dangers and fatigues could hardly produce enjoyment enough to gratify me for a few moments. The mind was as exhausted as the body, and I turned with indifference from the view which I had endured so much to behold, and throwing myself on the snow, behind a small mound which formed the highest point, and sheltered me from the wind, in a few seconds I was soundly buried in sleep, surrounded by the guides, who were all seeking repose, which neither the burning rays of the sun, nor the piercing cold of the snow, could prevent or disturb.'

After sleeping for a quarter of an hour, and taking a very little refreshment, (for the fever excited by the quickened respiration almost took away the appetite,) Mr Auldjo had leisure to observe the view. Of its extent there can be no question; of its 'beauties,' and 'wonders,' and 'splendour,' and 'sublimity,' about which he says so much, there may be very great doubt. Nothing can be discovered with any distinctness but the peaks of the mountain itself; the tops of others more distant; the Lake of Geneva, and one or two others; and the Vale of Chamouni. The sea, it is admitted, cannot be descried at all, being shut out by the Maritime Alps. The plains of France beyond the Jura 'appeared a wide and confused blue space.' The plains of Lombardy formed another 'immense blue surface;' and though the situations of Turin and Milan were pointed out, 'those cities were not visible.' Even the Valley of Chamouni, which, being the nearest, was the most visible object, was so indistinct, that the river Arne, running through it, looked like 'a silver thread.'

About twelve o'clock they began the descent, in the course of which, some time was saved by the plan of '*glisading*,' which is very particularly described. The dangers, as well as discomfort, of the return, were greatly increased by a violent storm of sleet, wind, and lightning; during part of which they had to seek shelter on a narrow ledge, under a projecting top of a glacier, and on the brink of a crevice, the bottom of which could not be descried.

'Nearly deprived of the use of my limbs, from the excessive cold and wet state of my apparel, I could scarcely walk; my fingers were nearly frozen, and my hands so stiffened and senseless that I could not hold my baton, or keep myself from falling. Supported by one guide, (the bank on which we were proceeding would admit of no more than two abreast,) I moved slowly forward, and in this state arrived at the

angle. The only change which appeared to have taken place was on the neck or tongue below the cliff. The day before, it touched, or slightly rested on the wall, but the end of it had fallen in, so that there was some difficulty in getting to it from the last step in the wall. One or two of the guides betrayed evident signs of fear, for the black thick clouds in which we were involved caused a gloominess approaching to darkness, and which was actually produced in the gulf of the fissure. The lightning flashed every moment, immediately followed, or rather accompanied, by claps of thunder, showing its proximity to us, and the loud peal, rolling among the mountains and glaciers, reverberated with most terrific grandeur, shaking the broken masses of the latter in such a manner, that we dreaded, at every explosion, to be hurled into the deep crevice, or crushed by the fall of some part of the glacier.

'This was not a time or situation to remain in longer than was necessary for cutting steps in the wall, instead of those which had been injured; nor was it a position in which any attempt could be made to restore life to my hands, or animation to my body. I had now nearly lost all feeling, from the effects of the cold; and, being incapable of making any exertion, I was lowered down to the guides, who were already on the ledge beneath the wall. At the very moment I was rocking in the air, a flash of lightning penetrated into the abyss, and showed all the horrors of my situation; while the crash of the thunder seemed to tear the glacier down upon me. I was drawn on to the neck of ice, and sat down until the other guides had descended. The hearts of two or three failed, and they declared that we must all perish; the others, although conscious of our awfully dangerous position, endeavoured to raise the courage and keep up the spirits of the depressed. All suffered dreadfully from the cold; but, with a solicitude, for which I shall ever be deeply grateful, they still attended to me in the kindest manner. They desired me to stand up, and forming a circle, in the centre of which I stood, closed round me. In a few minutes, the warmth of their bodies extended itself to mine, and I felt much relieved; they then took off their coats, covering me with them, and each in turn put my hands into his bosom, while another lay on my feet. In ten minutes, I was in a state to proceed; we divided equally the last half bottle of brandy, and then moved down the neck of ice. A guide gave me his thick cloak, which, though wet, kept me warm. I walked between two batons held horizontally by two guides, one before and the other behind me, and which I could grasp without taking my hands from under the cloak.'

Between six and seven o'clock they quitted the glacier, on which they had been about thirty hours; and at half past eight they reached the inn, from which they started a little more than thirty-seven hours before. It is needless to add, that their successful return was welcomed by the congratulations of all their friends, and of many spectators attracted to the spot by curiosity.

Notwithstanding the strictures which we have deemed it our duty to give, we too would be understood to join in these congratulations; trusting that our author will hereafter exert his enterprising and persevering spirit in the pursuit of some more

worthy object. If he shall be induced to do so by reflecting upon what is above written, or if any other young man, endowed with his powers to face danger and bear pain, shall be deterred from wasting them on such exploits, and either reserve himself for higher purposes, or not expose himself to any such bootless hazard, these feeble, but well-meant remarks, will not have been made in vain.

ART. XIII.—*Lectures on Sculpture.* By John Flaxman, Esq.  
R.A. 8vo. London. 1829.

THESE Lectures were delivered at the Royal Academy in an annual Course, instituted expressly for that purpose. They are not, on the whole, ill calculated to promote the object for which they were originally designed,—to guide the taste, and stimulate the enquiries of the student; but we should doubt whether there is much in them that is likely to interest the public. They may be characterised as the work of a sculptor by profession—dry and hard; a meagre outline, without colouring or adventitious ornament. The Editor states, that he has left them scrupulously as he found them: there are, in consequence, some faults of grammatical construction, of trifling consequence; and many of the paragraphs are thrown into the form of notes, or loose memorandums, and read like a table of contents. Nevertheless, there is a great and evident knowledge of the questions treated of; and wherever there is knowledge, there is power, and a certain degree of interest. It is only a pen guided by inanity or affectation, that can strip such subjects of instruction and amusement. Otherwise, the body of ancient or of modern Art is like the loadstone, to which the soul vibrates, responsive, however cold or repulsive the form in which it appears. We have, however, a more serious fault to object to the present work, than the mere defects of style, or mode of composition. It is with considerable regret and reluctance, we confess, that though it may add to the student's knowledge of the art, it will contribute little to the *understanding* of it. It abounds in rules rather than principles. The examples, authorities, precepts, are full, just, and well-selected. The terms of art are unexceptionably applied; the different styles very properly designated; the mean is distinguished from the lofty; due praise is bestowed on the *graceful*, the *grand*, the *beautiful*, the *ideal*; but the reader comprehends no more of the meaning of these qualities at the



end of the work than he did at the beginning. The tone of the Lectures is dogmatical rather than philosophical. The judgment for the most part is sound, though no new light is thrown on the grounds on which it rests. Mr Flaxman is contented to take up with traditional maxims, with adjudged cases, with the acknowledged theory and practice of art : and it is well that he does so ; for when he departs from the habitual bias of his mind, and attempts to enter into an explanation or defence of first principles, the reasons which he advances are often weak, warped, insufficient, or contradictory. His arguments are neither solid nor ingenious : They are merely quaint and gratuitous. If we were to hazard a general opinion, we should be disposed to say that a certain setness and formality, a certain want of flexibility and power, ran through the character of his whole mind. His compositions as a sculptor are classical,—cast in an approved mould ; but, generally speaking, they are elegant outlines,—poetical abstractions converted into marble, yet still retaining the essential character of words ; and the Professor's opinions and views of art as here collected, exhibit barely the surface and crust of commonly-received maxims, with little depth or originality. The characteristics of his mind were precision, elegance, cool judgment, industry, and a laudable and exclusive attachment to *the best*. He wanted richness, variety, and force. But we shall not dwell farther on these remarks here ; as examples and illustrations of them will occur in the course of this article.

The first Lecture, on the history of early British Sculpture, will be found to contain some novel and curious information. At its very commencement, however, we find two instances of perverse or obscure reasoning, which we cannot entirely pass over. In allusion to the original institution and objects of the Royal Academy, the author observes, that ‘ as the study of Sculpture was at that time confined within narrow limits, so the appointment of a Professorship in that art was not required, until the increasing taste of the country had given great popularity to the art itself, and native achievements had called on the powers of native Sculpture to celebrate British heroes and patriots.’ Does Mr Flaxman mean by this to insinuate that Britain had neither patriots nor heroes to boast of, till after the establishment of the Royal Academy, and a little before that of the Professorship of Sculpture ? If so, we cannot agree with him. It would be going only a single step farther to assert that the study of Astronomy had not been much encouraged in this country, till the discovery of the *Georgium Sidus* was thought to call for it, and for the establishment of an Observatory at Greenwich ! In the next page, the Lecturer remarks, ‘ Paint-

'ing is honoured with precedence, because Design or Drawing is more particularly and extensively employed in illustration of history. Sculpture immediately follows in the enumeration, because the two arts possess the same common principles, expressed by Painting in colour, and by Sculpture in form.' Surely, there is here some confusion, either in the thoughts or in the language. First, Painting takes precedence of Sculpture, because it illustrates history by design or form, which is common to both; next, Sculpture comes after Painting, because it illustrates by form, what Painting does *not* illustrate by form, but by colour. We cannot make any sense of this. It is from repeated similar specimens that we are induced to say, that when Mr Flaxman reasons, he reasons ill. But to proceed to something more grateful. The following is a condensed and patriotic sketch of the rise and early progress of Sculpture in our own country:

'The Saxons destroyed the works of Roman grandeur in Britain, burnt the cities from sea to sea, and reduced the country to barbarism again; but when these invaders were settled in their new possessions, they erected poor and clumsy imitations of the Roman buildings themselves had ruined. The Saxon Painting is rather preferable to their Sculpture, which, whether intended to represent the human or brutal figure, is frequently both horrible and burlesque. The buildings erected in England from the settlement of the Saxons to the reign of Henry I., continued nearly the same plain, heavy repetitions of columns and arches. So little was Sculpture employed in them, that no sepulchral statue is known in England before the time of William the Conqueror.

'Immediately after the Roman Conquest, figures of the deceased were carved, in bas-relief, on their gravestones, examples of which may be seen in the cloisters of Westminster Abbey, representing two abbots of that church, and in Worcester Cathedral, those of St Oswald and Bishop Wulstan. The Crusaders returned from the Holy Land; eager to imitate the arts and magnificence of other countries, they began to decorate the architecture with rich foliage, and to introduce statues against the columns; as we find in the west door of Rochester Cathedral, built in the reign of Henry I. Architecture now improved; Sculpture also became popular. The custom of carving a figure of the deceased in bas-relief on the tomb, seems likely to have been brought from France, where it was continued, in imitation of the Romans. Figures placed against columns might also be copied from examples in that country, of which one remarkable instance was a door in the church of St Germain de Prez, in Paris, containing several statues of the ancient kings of France, projecting from columns; a work of the 10th century, of which there are prints in Montfaucon's *Antiquities*.

'Sculpture continued to be practised with such zeal and success, that in the reign of Henry III. efforts were made deserving our respect and attention at this day. Bishop Joceline rebuilt the Cathedral Church of Wells from the pavement, which having lived to finish and dedicate, he

died in the year of our Lord 1242. The west front of this church equally testifies the piety and comprehension of the Bishop's mind ; the sculpture presents the noblest, most useful and interesting subjects possible to be chosen. On the south side, above the west door, are alto-relievos of the Creation in its different parts, the Deluge, and important acts of the Patriarchs. Companions to these on the north side are alto-relievos of the principal circumstances in the life of our Saviour. Above these are two rows of statues larger than nature, in niches, of kings, queens, and nobles, patrons of the church, saints, bishops, and other religious, from its first foundation to the reign of Henry III. Near the pediment is our Saviour come to judgment, attended by angels and his twelve apostles. The upper arches on each side, along the whole of the west front, and continued in the north and south ends, are occupied by figures rising from their graves, strongly expressing the hope, fear, astonishment, stupefaction, or despair, inspired by the presence of the Lord and Judge of the world in that awful moment. In speaking of the execution of such a work, due regard must be paid to the circumstances under which it was produced, in comparison with those of our own times. There were neither prints nor printed books to assist the artist. The Sculptor could not be instructed in Anatomy, for there were no Anatomists. Some knowledge of Optics, and a glimmering of Perspective, were reserved for the researches of so sublime a genius as Roger Bacon, some years afterwards. A small knowledge of Geometry and Mechanics was exclusively confined to two or three learned monks in the whole country ; and the principles of those sciences, as applied to the figure and motion of man and inferior animals, were known to none ! *Therefore* this work is *necessarily ill drawn*, and deficient in principle, and much of the sculpture is rude and severe ; yet in parts there is a beautiful simplicity, an irresistible sentiment, and sometimes a grace, excelling more modern productions.

‘ It is very remarkable that Wells Cathedral was finished in 1242, two years after the birth of Cimabue, the restorer of painting in Italy ; and the work was going on at the same time that Nicolo Pisano, the Italian restorer of sculpture, exercised the art in his own country : it was also finished forty-six years before the Cathedral of Amiens, and thirty-six before the Cathedral of Orvieto was begun ; and it seems to be the first specimen of such magnificent and varied sculpture, united in a series of sacred history, that is to be found in Western Europe. It is, therefore, probable that the general idea of the work might be brought from the East by some of the Crusaders. But there are two arguments strongly in favour of the execution being English : the family name of the Bishop is English, “ Jocelyn Trotteman ;” and the style, both of sculpture and architecture, is wholly different from the tombs of Edward the Confessor and Henry III., which were by Italian artists.

‘ The reign of Edward I. produced a new species of monument. When Eleanor the beloved wife of that monarch died, who had been his heroic and affectionate companion in the Holy War, he raised some crosses of magnificent architecture, adorned with statues of his departed queen, wherever her corpse rested on the way to its interment in Westminster

Abbey. Three of these crosses still remain, at Northampton, Geddington, and Waltham. The statues have considerable simplicity and delicacy; they partake of the character and grace particularly cultivated in the school of Pisano; and it is not unlikely, as the sepulchral statue and tomb of Henry III. were executed by Italians, that these statues of Queen Eleanor might be done by some of the numerous travelling scholars from Pisano's school.

'The long and prosperous reign of Edward III. was as favourable to literature and liberal arts, as to the political and commercial interests of the country. So generally were painting, sculpture, and architecture encouraged and employed, that besides the buildings raised in this reign, few sacred edifices existed, which did not receive additions and decorations. The richness, novelty, and beauty of architecture may be seen in York and Gloucester Cathedrals, and many of our other churches: besides the extraordinary fancy displayed in various intricate and diversified figures which form the mullions of windows, they were occasionally enriched with a profusion of foliage and historical sculpture, equally surprising for beauty and novelty. In the chancel of Dorchester Church, near Oxford, are three windows of this kind, one of which, besides rich foliage, is adorned with twenty-eight small statues relating to the genealogy of our Saviour; and the other two with alto-relievos from acts of his life.'

Mr Flaxman then proceeds to trace the progress of Sculpture, and the growing passion for it in this country, through the reign of Henry VII. to the period when its prospects were blighted by the Reformation, and many of its monuments defaced by the Iconoclastic fury of the Puritans and zealots in the time of Charles I. The Lecturer seems to be of opinion that the genius of sculpture in our island was arrested, in the full career of excellence, and when it was approaching the goal of perfection, by these two events; which drew aside the public attention, and threw a stigma on the encouragement of sacred sculpture; whereas, it would perhaps be just as fair to argue, that these events would never have happened, had it not been for a certain indifference in the national character to mere outward impressions, and a slowness to appreciate, or form an enthusiastic attachment to objects that appeal only to the imagination and the senses. We may be influenced by higher and more solid principles,—reason and philosophy; but that makes nothing to the question. Mr Flaxman bestows great and deserved praise on the monuments of Aylmer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke, and Edmund Crouchback, in Westminster Abbey, which are by English artists, whose names are preserved; but speaks slightly of the tomb of Henry VII. and his wife, in Henry VII.'s Chapel, by Torregiano; from whom, on trivial and insufficient grounds, he withholds the merit of the other sculptures and ornaments of the chapel. This is prejudice, and not

wisdom. We think the tomb alone will be monument enough to that artist in the opinion of all who have seen it. We have no objection to, but on the contrary applaud the Lecturer's zeal to repel the imputation of incapacity from British art, and to detect the lurking traces and doubtful prognostics of it in the records of our early history; but we are, at the same time, convinced that tenaciousness on this point creates an unfavourable presumption on the other side; and we make bold to submit, that whenever the national capacity bursts forth in the same powerful and striking way in the Fine Arts that it has done in so many others, we shall no longer have occasion to praise ourselves for what we either have done, or what we are to do:—the world will soon be loud in the acknowledgment of it. Works of ornament and splendour must dazzle and claim attention at the first sight, or they do not answer their end. They are not like the deductions of an abstruse philosophy, or even improvements in practical affairs, which may make their way slowly and under-ground. They are not a light placed under a bushel, but like 'a city set on a hill, that cannot be hid.' To *appear* and to *be*, are with them the same thing. Neither are we much better satisfied with the arguments of the learned Professor to show that the series of statuary in Wells Cathedral is of native English workmanship. The difference of style from the tombs of Edward the Confessor and Henry III. by Italians, can be of little weight at a period when the principles of art were so unsettled, and each person did the best he could, according to his own taste and knowledge; and as to the second branch of the evidence, viz. that 'the family-name of the Bishop 'is English, Jocelyn Trotteman,' it sounds too much like a parody on the story of him who wanted to prove his descent from the 'Admirable Crichton,' by his having a family cup in his possession with the initials A. C. !

We dwell the longer and more willingly on the details and recollections of the early works of which the author speaks so feelingly, as first informed with life and sentiment, because all relating to that remote period of architecture and sculpture, exercises a peculiar charm and fascination over our minds. It is not art in its 'high and palmy state,' with its boasted refinements about it, that we look at with envy and wonder, so much as in its first rude attempts and conscious yearnings after excellence. They were, indeed, the favoured of the earth, into whom genius first breathed the breath of life; who, born in a night of ignorance, first beheld the sacred dawn of light—those Deucalions of art, who, after the deluge of barbarism and violence had subsided, stood alone in the world, and had to sow the seeds of

countless generations of knowledge. We can conceive of some village Michael Angelo, with a soul too mighty for its tenement of clay, whose longing aspirations after truth and good were palsied by the refusal of his hand to execute them,—struggling to burst the trammels and trying to shake off the load of discouragement that oppressed him: What must be his exultation to see the speaking statue, the stately pile, rise up slowly before him,—the idea in his mind embodied out of nothing, without model or precedent,—to see a huge cathedral heave its ponderous weight above the earth, or the solemn figure of an apostle point from one corner of it to the skies; and to think that future ages would, perhaps, gaze at the work with the same delight and wonder that his own did, and not suffer his name to sink into the same oblivion as those who had gone before him, or as the brutes that perish;—this was, indeed, to be admitted into the communion, the ‘holiest of holies’ of genius, and to drink of the waters of life freely! Art, as it springs from the source of genius, is like the act of creation: it has the same obscurity and grandeur about it. Afterwards, whatever perfection it attains, it becomes mechanical. Its strongest impulse and inspiration is derived, not from what it has done, but from what it has to do. It is not surprising that from this state of anxiety and awe with which it regards its appointed task,—the unknown bourne that lies before it, such startling revelations of the world of truth and beauty are often struck out when one might least expect it, and that Art has sometimes leaped at one vast bound from its cradle to its grave! Mr Flaxman, however, strongly inculcates the contrary theory, and is for raising up Art to its most majestic height by the slow and circuitous process of an accumulation of rules and machinery. He seems to argue that its advance is on a gradually inclined plane, keeping pace and co-extended with that of Science; ‘growing ‘with its growth and strengthening with its strength.’ It appears to us that this is not rightly to weigh the essential differences either of Science or of Art; and that it is flying in the face both of fact and argument. He says, it took sculpture nine hundred or a thousand years to advance from its first rude commencement to its perfection in Greece and Egypt: But we must remember, that the greatest excellence of the Fine Arts, both in Greece, Italy, and Holland, was concentrated into little more than a century; and again, if Art and Science were synonymous, there can be no doubt that the knowledge of anatomy and geometry is more advanced in England in the present day than it was at Athens in the time of Pericles; but is our sculp-

ture therefore superior? The answer to this is, 'No; but it ought to be, and it will be.' Spare us, good Mr Prophesier! Art cannot be transmitted by a receipt, or theorem, like Science; and cannot therefore be improved *ad libitum*: It has inseparably to do with individual nature and individual genius.

The Second Lecture is on Egyptian Sculpture, and here Mr Flaxman displays the same accurate information and diligent research as before. The Egyptian statues, the Sphinx, the Memnon, &c. were, as is well known, principally distinguished for their size, and the immense labour and expense bestowed upon them. The critic thus justly characterizes their style and merits:

'The Egyptian statues stand equally poised on both legs, having one foot advanced, the arms either hanging straight down on each side; or, if one is raised, it is at a right angle across the body. Some of the statues sit on seats, some on the ground, and some are kneeling; but the position of the hands seldom varies from the above description; their attitudes are of course simple, rectilinear, and without lateral movement; the faces are rather flat, the brows, eyelids, and mouth formed of simple curves, slightly but sharply marked, and with little expression; the general proportions are something more than seven heads high; the form of the body and limbs rather round and effeminate, with only the most evident projections and hollows. Their tunics, or rather draperies, are in many instances without folds. Winckelman has remarked, that the Egyptians executed quadrupeds better than human figures; for which he gives the two following reasons: first, That as professions in that country were hereditary, genius must be wanting to represent the human form in perfection; secondly, That superstitious reverence for the works of their ancestors prevented improvements. This is an amusing, but needless hypothesis: for there are statues in the Capitoline Museum with as great a breadth, and choice of grand parts proper to the human form, as ever they represented in their lions, or other inferior animals. In addition to these observations on Egyptian statues, we may remark, the forms of their hands and feet are gross; they have no anatomical detail of parts, and are totally deficient in the grace of motion. This last defect, in all probability, was not the consequence of a superstitious determination to persist in the practice of their ancestors; it is accounted for in another and better way.

'Pythagoras, after he had studied several years in Egypt, sacrificed a hundred oxen in consequence of having discovered, that a square of the longest side of a right-angled triangle is equal to the two squares of the lesser sides of the same triangle; and thence it follows, that the knowledge of the Egyptians could not have been very great at that time in geometry. This will naturally account for that want of motion in their statues and relievos, which can only be obtained by a careful observation of nature, assisted by geometry.'

This is, we apprehend, one of the weak points of Mr Flax-

man's reasoning. That geometry may be of great use to fix and ascertain certain general principles of the art, we are far from disputing; but surely it was no more necessary for the Egyptian sculptor to wait for the discovery of Pythagoras's problem before he could venture to detach the arms from the sides, than it was for the Egyptians themselves to remain swathed and swaddled up like mummies, without the power of locomotion, till Pythagoras came with his geometrical diagram to set their limbs at liberty. If they could do this without a knowledge of mechanics, the sculptor could not help seeing it, and imperfectly copying it, if he had the use of his senses or his wits about him. The greater probability is, that the sepulchral statues were done from, or in imitation of the mummies; or that as the imitation of variety of gesture or motion is always the most difficult, these stiff and monotonous positions were adopted (and subsequently adhered to from custom) as the safest and easiest. After briefly noticing the defects of the Hindoo and other early sculpture, the author proceeds to account for the improved practice of the Greeks on the same formal and mechanic principles.

'We find,' he says, 'upon these authorities (Vitruvius and the elder Pliny), that geometry and numbers were employed to ascertain the powers of motion and proportions; optics and perspective (as known to the ancients) to regulate projections, hollows, keeping, diminution, curvatures, and general effects in figures, groups, insulated or in relief, with accompaniments; and anatomy, to represent the bones, muscles, tendons, and veins, *as they appear on the surface of the human body and inferior animals.*

'In this enlightened age, when the circle of science is so generally and well understood—when the connexion and relation of one branch with another is demonstrated, and their principles applied from necessity and conviction, wherever possibility allows, in the liberal and mechanical arts, as well as all the other concerns of life—no one can be weak or absurd enough to suppose it is within the ability and province of human genius, without the principles of science previously acquired—by *slight observation only*—to become possessed of the forms, characters, and essences of objects, in such a manner as to represent them with truth, force, and pathos at once! No; we are convinced by reason and experience, that "life is short and art is long;" and the perfection of all human productions depends on the indefatigable accumulation of knowledge and labour through a succession of ages.'—P. 55.

This paragraph, we cannot but think, proceeds altogether on a false estimate: it is a misdirection to the student. In following up the principles here laid down, the artist's life would not only be short, but misspent. Is there no medium, in our critic's view of this matter, between a 'slight observation' of nature, and scientific demonstration? If so, we will say there can



be no fine art at all : For mere abstract and formal rules cannot produce truth, force, and pathos in individual forms ; and it is equally certain that ' slight observation ' will not answer the end, if all but learned pedantry is to be accounted casual and superficial. This is to throw a slur on the pursuit, and an impediment in the way of the art itself. Mr Flaxman seems here to suppose that our observation is profound and just, not according to the delicacy, comprehensiveness, or steadiness of the attention we bestow upon a given object ; but depends on the discovery of some other object which was before hid ; or on the intervention of mechanical rules, which supersede the exercise of our senses and judgments—as if the outward appearance of things was concealed by a film of abstraction, which could only be removed by the spectacles of books. Thus, anatomy is said to be necessary ' to represent the bones, muscles, tendons, and ' veins, as they appear on the surface of the human body ; ' so that it is to be presumed, that the anatomist, when he has with his knife and instruments laid bare the internal structure of the body, sees at a glance what he did not before see ; but that the artist, after poring over them all his life, is blind to the external appearance of veins, muscles, &c., till the seeing what is concealed under the skin enables him for the first time to see what appears through it. We do not deny that the knowledge of the internal conformation helps to explain and to determine the *meaning* of the outward appearance ; what we object to as unwarrantable and pernicious doctrine, is substituting the one process for the other, and speaking slightly of the study of nature in the comparison. It shows a want of faith in the principles and purposes of the Art itself, and a wish to confound and prop it up with the grave mysteries and formal pretensions of Science ; which is to take away its essence and its pride. The student who sets to work under such an impression, may accumulate a great deal of learned lumber, and envelope himself in diagrams, demonstrations, and the whole circle of the sciences ; but while he is persuaded that the study of nature is but a ' slight ' part of his task, he will never be able to draw, colour, or *express* a single object, farther than this can be done by a rule and compasses. The crutches of science will not lend wings to genius. Suppose a person were to tell us, that if he pulled off his coat and laid bare his arm, this would give us (with all the attention we could bestow upon it) no additional insight into its form, colour, or the appearance of veins and muscles on the surface, unless he at the same time suffered us to *flay it* ; should we not laugh in his face as wanting common sense, or conclude that he was laughing at us ? So the late Professor of Sculpture

lays little stress in accounting for the progress of Grecian art on the perfection which the human form acquired, and the opportunities for studying its varieties and movements in the Olympic exercises; but considers the whole miracle as easily solved, when the anatomist came with his probe and ploughed up the surface of the flesh, and the geometrician came with his line and plummet, and demonstrated the centre of gravity. He sums up the question in these words: ‘In the early times of Greece, Pausanias informs us the twelve Gods were worshipped in Arcadia, under the forms of rude stones; and before Dædalus the statues had eyes nearly shut, the arms attached to their sides, and the legs close together; but as geometry, mechanics, arithmetic, and anatomy improved, painting and sculpture acquired action, proportion, and detailed parts.’ As to the slight account that is made in this reasoning of the immediate observation of visible objects, the point may be settled by an obvious dilemma: Either the eye sees the whole of any object before it; or it does not. If it sees and comprehends the whole of it with all its parts and relations, then it must retain and be able to give a faithful and satisfactory resemblance, without calling in the aid of rules or science to prevent or correct errors and defects; just as the human face or form is perfectly represented in a looking-glass. But if the eye sees only a small part of what any visible object contains in it,—has only a glimmering of colour, proportion, expression, &c., then this incipient and imperfect knowledge may be improved to an almost infinite degree by close attention, by study and practice, and by comparing a succession of objects with one another; which is the proper and essential province of the artist, independently of abstract rules or science. On further observation we notice many details in a face which escaped us at the first glance; by a study of faces and of mankind practically, we perceive expressions which the generality do not perceive; but this is not done by rule. The fallacy is in supposing that all that the first naked or hasty observation does not give, is supplied by science and general theories, and not by a closer and continued observation of the thing itself, so that all that belongs to the latter department is necessarily casual and slight.

Mr Flaxman enforces the same argument by quoting the rules laid down by Vitruvius, for ascertaining the true principles of form and motion. This writer says, ‘If a man lies on his back, his arms and legs may be so extended, that a circle may be drawn round, touching the extremities of his fingers and toes, the centre of which circle shall be his navel: also, that, a man standing upright, the length of his arms, when fully ex-

'tended, is equal to his height; thus that the circle and the square equally contain the general form and motion of the human figure.' From these hints, and the profound mathematical train of reasoning with which Leonardo da Vinci has pursued the subject, the author adds, that a complete system of the principles followed by the ancient Greek sculptors may be drawn out: that is to say, that because all the inflections of figure and motion of which the human body is susceptible, are contained within the above-mentioned circle or square, the knowledge of this formal generality *includes* a knowledge of all the subordinate and implied particulars. The contortions of the Laocoon, the agony of the Children, the look of the Dying Gladiator, the contours of the Venus, the grace and spirit of the Apollo, are all, it seems, contained within the limits of the circle or the square! Just as well might it be contended, that having got a square or oval frame, of the size of a picture by Titian or Vandyke, every one is qualified to paint a face within it equal in force or beauty to Titian or Vandyke.

In the same spirit of a determination to make Art a handmaid attendant upon Science, the author thus proceeds: 'Pliny says, lib. xxxiv. c. 8, Leontius, the contemporary of Phidias, first expressed tendons and veins—*primus nervos et venas expressit*—which was immediately after the anatomical researches and improvements of Hippocrates, Democritus, and their disciples; and we shall find in the same manner all the improvements in art followed improvements in science.' Yet almost in the next page, Mr Flaxman himself acknowledges, that even in the best times of Grecian sculpture, and the era of Phidias and Praxiteles, dissections were rare, and anatomy very imperfectly understood, and cites 'the opinion of the learned Professor of Anatomy, that the ancient artists owed much more to the study of living than dead bodies.' Sir Anthony Carlisle, aware of the deficiencies of former ages in this branch of knowledge, and yet conscious that he himself would be greatly puzzled to carve the Apollo or the Venus, very naturally and wisely concludes, that the latter depends upon a course of study, and an acquaintance with forms very different from any which he possesses. It is a smattering and affectation of science that leads men to suppose that it is capable of more than it really is, and of supplying the undefined and evanescent creations of art with universal and infallible principles. There cannot be an opinion more productive of presumption and sloth.

The same turn of thought is insisted on in the Fourth Lecture, *On Science*; and indeed nearly the whole of that Lecture is devoted to a fuller developement and exemplification of what ap-

appears to be a servile prejudice. It would be unjust, however, to Mr Flaxman, to suppose, or to insinuate, that he is without a better sense and better principles of art, whenever he trusted to his own feelings and experience, instead of being hoodwinked by an idle theory. Nothing can be more excellent than the following observations which occur towards the conclusion of the Lecture on *Composition* :

‘ What has been delivered comprises some of the rules for composing, and observations on composition, the most obvious, and perhaps not the least useful. They have been collected from the best works and the best writings, examined and compared with their principles in nature. Such a comprehensive view may be serviceable to the younger student, in pointing his way, preventing error, and showing the needful materials ; *but after all, he must perform the work himself!* All rules, all critical discourses, can but awaken the intelligence, and stimulate the will, with advice and directions, for a beginning of that which is to be done. They may be compared to the scaffolding for raising a magnificent palace ; it is neither the building nor the decoration, but it is the workman’s indispensable help in erecting the walls which enclose the apartments, and which may afterwards be enriched with the most splendid ornaments. Every painter and sculptor feels a conviction that a considerable portion of science is requisite to the productions of liberal art ; but he will be equally convinced, that whatever is produced from principles and rules only, added to the most exquisite manual labour, is no more than a mechanical work. Sentiment is the life and soul of fine art ; without which it is all a dead letter ! Sentiment gives a sterling value, an irresistible charm to the rudest imagery or most unpractised scrawl. By this quality a firm alliance is formed with the affections in all works of art. With an earnest watchfulness for their preservation, we are made to perceive and feel the most sublime and terrific subjects, following the course of sentiment, through the current and mazes of intelligence and passion, to the most delicate and tender ties and sympathies.’

From the account of Grecian sculpture, in the third Lecture, which is done with care and judgment, we select the following descriptions of the Minerva and Jupiter of Phidias :—

‘ Within the temple (at the Acropolis of Athens) stood the statue of Minerva, thirty-nine feet high, made by Phidias, of ivory and gold, holding a victory, six feet high, in her right hand, and a spear in her left, her tunic reaching to her feet. She had her helmet on, and the Medusa’s head on her ægis ; her shield was adorned with the battle of the gods and giants, the pedestal with the birth of Pandora. Plato tells us that the eyes of this statue were precious stones. But the great work of this chief of sculptors, the astonishment and praise of after ages, was the Jupiter at Elis, sitting on his throne, his left hand holding a sceptre, his right extending victory to the Olympian conquerors, his head crowned with olive, and his pallium decorated with birds, beasts, and flowers. The four corners of the throne were dancing victories, each supported by a sphinx, tearing a Theban youth. At the back of the throne, above

his head, were the three horns, or seasons, on one side, and on the other the three Graces. On the bar, between the legs of the throne, and the panels, or spaces, between them, were represented many stories—the destruction of Niobe's children, the labours of Hercules, the delivery of Prometheus, the garden of Hesperides, with the different adventures of the heroic ages. On the base, the battle of Theseus with the Amazons; on the pedestal, an assembly of the gods, the sun and moon in their cars, and the birth of Venus. The height of the work was sixty feet. The statue was ivory, enriched with the radiance of golden ornaments and precious stones, and was justly esteemed one of the seven wonders of the world.

‘Several other statues of great excellence, in marble and in bronze, are mentioned among the works of Phidias, particularly a Venus, placed by the Romans in the forum of Octavia; two Minervas, one named Calimorphus, from the beauty of its form; and it is likely that the fine statue of this goddess in Mr Hope's gallery is a repetition in marble of Phidias's bronze, from its resemblance in attitude, drapery, and helmet, to the reverse of an Athenian coin. Another statue by him was an Amazon, called Eutnemon, from her beautiful legs. There is a print of this in the *Museum Pium Clementinum*.’

With the name of Phidias, Mr Flaxman couples that of Praxiteles, and gives the following spirited sketch of him and his works:—

‘Praxiteles excelled in the highest graces of youth and beauty. He is said to have excelled not only other sculptors, but himself, by his marble statues in the Ceramicus of Athens; but his Venus was preferable to all others in the world, and many sailed to Cnidos for the purpose of seeing it. This sculptor having made two statues of Venus, one with drapery, the other without, the Coans preferred the clothed figure, on account of its severe modesty, the same price being set upon each. The citizens of Cnidos took the rejected statue, and afterwards refused it to King Nicomedes, who would have forgiven them an immense debt in return; but they were resolved to suffer any thing, so long as this statue, by Praxiteles, ennobled Cnidos. The temple was entirely open in which it was placed, because every view was equally admirable. This Venus was still in Cnidos during the reign of the Emperor Arcadius, about 400 years after Christ. Among the known works of Praxiteles are his Satyr, Cupid, Apollo, the Lizard-killer, and Bacchus leaning on a Faun.’

But we must stop short in this list of famous names and enchanting works, or we should never have done. This seems to have been the fabulous age of sculpture, when marble started into life as in a luxurious dream, and men appeared to have no other employment than ‘to make Gods in their own image.’ The Lecturer bestows due and eloquent praise on the horses in the Elgin collection, which he supposes to have been done under the superintendence, and probably from designs by Phidias; but we are sorry he has not extended his eulogium to the figure of the

Theseus, which appears to us a world of grace and grandeur in itself, and to say to the sculptor's art, '*Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther!*' What went before it was rude in the comparison; what came after it was artificial. It is the perfection of *style*, and would have afforded a much better exemplification of the force and meaning of that term than the schoolboy definition adopted in the Lecture on this subject; namely, that as poets and engravers used a *stylos*, or style, to execute their works, the name of the instrument was metaphorically applied to express the art itself. *Style* properly means the mode of representing nature; and this again arises from the various character of men's minds, and the infinite variety of views which may be taken of nature. After seeing the Apollo, the Hercules, and other celebrated works of antiquity, we seem to have exhausted our stock of admiration, and to conceive that there is no higher perfection for sculpture to attain, or to aspire to. But at the first sight of the Elgin Marbles, we feel that we have been in a mistake, and the ancient objects of our idolatry fall into an inferior class or style of art. They are comparatively, and without disparagement of their vast and almost superhuman merit, *stuck-up* gods and goddesses. But a new principle is at work in the others which we had not seen or felt the want of before (not a studied trick, or curious refinement, but an obvious truth, arising from a more intimate acquaintance with, and firmer reliance on, nature;)—a principle of fusion, of motion, so that the marble flows like a wave. The common *antiques* represent the most perfect forms and proportions, with each part perfectly understood and executed; every thing is brought out; every thing is made as exquisite and imposing as it can be in itself; but each part seems to be cut out of the marble, and to answer to a model of itself in the artist's mind. But in the fragment of the Theseus, the whole is melted into one impression like wax; there is all the flexibility, the malleableness of flesh; there is the same alternate tension and relaxation; the same sway and yielding of the parts; 'the right hand knows what the left hand doeth;' and the statue bends and plays under the framer's mighty hand and eye, as if, instead of being a block of marble, it was provided with an internal machinery of nerves and muscles, and felt every the slightest pressure or motion from one extremity to the other. This, then, is the greatest grandeur of style, from the comprehensive idea of the whole, joined to the greatest simplicity, from the entire union and subordination of the parts. There is no ostentation, no stiffness, no overlaboured finishing. Every thing is in its place and degree, and put to its proper use. The greatest power is combined with the greatest ease: there is the per-

fection of knowledge, with the total absence of a conscious display of it. We find so little of an appearance of art or labour, that we might be almost tempted to suppose that the whole of these groups were done by means of *casts* from fine nature; for it is to be observed, that the commonest cast from nature has the same *style* or character of union and reaction of parts, being copied from that which has life and motion in itself. What adds a passing gleam of probability to such a suggestion is, that these statues were placed at a height where only the general effect could be distinguished, and that the back and hinder parts, which are just as scrupulously finished as the rest, and as true to the mould of nature, were fixed against a wall where they could not be seen at all; and where the labour (if we do not suppose it to be in a great measure abridged mechanically) was wholly thrown away. However, we do not lay much stress on this consideration; for we are aware that 'the labour we delight in 'physics pain,' and we believe that the person who *could* do the statue of the Theseus, *would* do it, under all circumstances, and without fee or reward of any kind. We conceive that the Elgin Marbles settle another disputed point of vital interest to the arts. Sir Joshua Reynolds contends, among others, that grandeur of style consists in giving only the *masses*, and leaving out the details. The statues we are speaking of repudiate this doctrine, and at least demonstrate the possibility of uniting the two things, which had been idly represented to be incompatible, as if they were not obviously found together in nature. A great number of parts may be collected into one mass; as, on the other hand, a work may equally want minute details, or large and imposing masses. Suppose all the light to be thrown on one side of a face, and all the shadow on the other: the *chiaroscuro* may be worked up with the utmost delicacy and pains in the one, and every vein or freckle distinctly marked on the other, without destroying the general effect—that is, the two broad masses of light and shade. Mr Flaxman takes notice that there were two eras of Grecian art before the time of Pericles and Phidias, when it was at its height. In the first they gave only a gross or formal representation of the objects; so that you could merely say, 'This is a man, that is a horse.' To this clumsy concrete style succeeded the most elaborate finishing of parts, without selection, grace, or grandeur. 'Elaborate finishing was 'soon afterwards' [after the time of Dædalus and his scholars] 'carried to excess: undulating locks and spiral knots of hair 'like shells, as well as the drapery, were wrought with the most 'elaborate care and exactness; whilst the tasteless and barbarous character of the face and limbs remained much the same as in

'former times.' This was the natural course of things, to denote first the gross object; then to run into the opposite extreme, and give none but the detached parts. The difficulty was to unite the two in a noble and comprehensive idea of nature.

We are chiefly indebted for the information or amusement we derive from Mr Flaxman's work, to the historical details of his subject. We cannot say that he has removed any of the doubts or stumbling-blocks in our way, or extended the landmarks of taste or reasoning. We turned with some interest to the *Lecture on Beauty*; for the artist has left specimens of this quality in several of his works. We were a good deal disappointed. It sets out in this manner: 'That beauty is not merely an imaginary quality, but a real essence, may be inferred from the harmony of the universe; and the perfection of its wondrous parts we may understand from all surrounding nature; and in this course of observation we find, that man has more of beauty bestowed on him as he rises higher in creation.' The rest is of a piece with this exordium,—containing a dissertation on the various gradations of being, of which man is said to be at the top,—on the authority of Socrates, who argues, 'that the human form is the most perfect of all forms, because it contains in it the principles and powers of all inferior forms.' This assertion is either a flat contradiction of the fact, or an *antique* riddle, which we do not pretend to solve. Indeed, we hold the ancients, with all our veneration for them, to have been wholly destitute of philosophy in this department; and Mr Flaxman, who was taught when he was young to look up to them for light and instruction in the philosophy of art, has engrafted too much of it on his Lectures. He defines beauty thus: 'The most perfect human beauty is that *most free from deformity*, either of body or mind, and may be therefore defined—The most perfect soul is the most perfect body.'

In support of this truism, he strings a number of quotations together, as if he were stringing pearls:

'In Plato's dialogue concerning the beautiful, he shows the power and influence of mental beauty on corporeal; and in his dialogue, entitled "The Greater Hippias," Socrates observes in argument, "that as a beautiful vase is inferior to a beautiful horse, and as a beautiful horse is not to be compared to a beautiful virgin, in the same manner a beautiful virgin is inferior in beauty to the immortal Gods; for," says he, "there is a beauty incorruptible, ever the same." It is remarkable, that, immediately after, he says, "Phidias is skilful in beauty." Aristotle, the scholar of Plato, begins his Treatise on Morals thus:—"Every art, every method and institution, every action and council, seems to seek some good; therefore the ancients pronounced the beautiful to be good." Much, indeed, might be collected from this philoso-



pher's treatises on morals, poetics, and physiognomy, of the greatest importance to our subject ; but for the present we shall produce only two quotations from Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, which contain the immediate application of these principles to the arts of design. In the dialogue between Socrates and the sculptor Clito, Socrates concludes, that " Statuary must represent the emotions of the soul by form ;" and in the former part of the same dialogue, Parrhasius and Socrates agree, that " the good and evil qualities of the soul may be represented in the figure of man by painting." In the applications from this dialogue to our subject, we must remember, philosophy demonstrates that rationality and intelligence, although connected with animal nature, rises above it, and properly exists in a more exalted state. From such contemplations and maxims, the ancient artists sublimated the sentiments of their works, expressed in the choicest forms of nature ; thus they produced their divinities, heroes, patriots, and philosophers, adhering to the principle of Plato, that " nothing is beautiful which is not good ;" it was this which, in ages of polytheism and idolatry, still continued to enforce a popular impression of divine attributes and perfection.

If the ancient sculptors had had nothing but such maxims and contemplations as these to assist them in forming their statues, they would have been greatly to seek indeed ! Take these homilies on the Beautiful and the Good, together with Euclid's *Elements*, into any country town in England, and see if you can make a modern Athens of it. The Greek artists did not learn to put expression into their works, because Socrates had said, that ' statuary must represent the emotions of the soul ' by form ;' but he said that they ought to do so, because he had seen it done by Phidias and others. It was from the diligent study and contemplation of ' the choicest forms of nature,' and from the natural love of beauty and grandeur in the human breast, and not from ' shreds and patches,' of philosophy, that they drew their conceptions of Gods and men. Let us not, however, be thought hard on the metaphysics of the ancients : they were the first to propose these questions, and to feel the curiosity and the earnest desire to know what the *beautiful* and the *good* meant. If the will was not tantamount to the deed, it was scarcely their fault ; and perhaps, instead of blaming their partial success, we ought rather to take shame to ourselves for the little progress we have made, and the dubious light that has been shed upon such questions since. If the Professor of Sculpture had sought for the principles of beauty in the antique statues, instead of the *scholia* of the commentators, he probably might have found it to resolve itself (according, at least, to their peculiar and favourite view of it) into a certain symmetry of form, answering in a great measure, to harmony of colouring, or of musical sounds. We do not here affect to lay down a metaphysical

theory, but to criticise an historical fact. We are not bold enough to say, that beauty in general depends on a regular gradation and correspondence of lines, but we may safely assert that Grecian beauty does. If we take any beautiful Greek statue, we shall find that, seen in profile, the forehead and nose form nearly a perpendicular straight line; and that finely turned at that point, the lower part of the face falls by gentle and almost equal curves to the chin. The cheek is full and round, and the outline of the side of the face a general sloping line. In front, the eyebrows are straight, or gently curved; the eyelids full and round to match, answering to that of Belphebe, in Spenser—

‘ Upon her eyebrows many Graces sat,  
Under the shadow of her even brows:’

The space between the eyebrows is broad, and the two sides of the nose straight, and nearly parallel; the nostrils form large and distinct curves; the lips are full and even, the corners being large; the chin is round, and rather short, forming, with the two sides of the face, a regular oval. The opposite to this, the Grecian model of beauty, is to be seen in the contour and features of the African face, where all the lines, instead of corresponding to, or melting into, one another, in a kind of *rhythmus* of form, are sharp, angular, and at cross purposes. Where strength and majesty were to be expressed by the Greeks, they adopted a greater squareness, but there was the same unity and correspondence of outline. Greek grace is harmony of movement. The *ideal* may be regarded as a certain predominant quality or character (this may be ugliness or deformity as well as beauty, as is seen in the forms of fauns and satyrs) diffused over all the parts of an object, and carried to the utmost pitch, that our acquaintance with visible models, and our conception of the imaginary object, will warrant. It is extending our impressions farther, raising them higher, than usual, from the *actual* to the *possible*.\* How far we can enlarge our discoveries from the one of these to the other, is a point of some nicety. In treating on this question, our author thus distinguishes the Natural and the Ideal Styles :

‘ The Natural Style may be defined thus : a representation of the human form, according to the distinction of sex and age, in action or repose, expressing the affections of the soul. The same words may be

---

\* Verse and poetry has its source in this principle ; it is the harmony of the soul imparted from the strong impulse of pleasure to language and to indifferent things ; as a person hearing music walks in a sustained and measured step over uneven ground.

used to define the Ideal Style, but they must be followed by this addition—*selected from such perfect examples as may excite in our minds a conception of the preternatural.* By these definitions will be understood that the Natural Style is peculiar to humanity, and the Ideal to spirituality and divinity.

We should be inclined to say, that the female divinities of the ancients were Goddesses because they were *ideal*, rather than that they were *ideal* because they belonged to the class of Goddesses; ‘By their own beauty were they deified.’ Of the difficulty of passing the line that separates the actual from the imaginary world, some test may be formed by the suggestion thrown out a little way back; *viz.* that the *ideal* is exemplified in systematizing and enhancing any idea, whether of beauty or deformity, as in the case of the fauns and satyrs of antiquity. The expressing of depravity and grossness is produced here by approximating the human face and figure to that of the brute; so that the mind runs along this line from one to the other, and carries the wished-for resemblance as far as it pleases. But here both the extremes are equally well known, equally objects of sight and observation; insomuch that there might be a literal substitution of the one for the other; but in the other case, of elevating character and portraying Gods as men, one of the extremes is missing; and the combining the two, is combining a positive image with an unknown abstraction. To represent a Jupiter or Apollo, we take the best species, (as it seems to us,) and select the best of that species: how we are to get beyond that *best*, without any given form or visible image to refer to, it is not easy to determine. The *ideal*, according to Mr Flaxman, is ‘the scale by which to heaven we do ascend;’ but it is a hazardous undertaking to soar above reality, by embodying an abstraction. If the ancients could have seen the immortal Gods, with their bodily sense, (as it was said that Jupiter had revealed himself to Phidias,) they might have been enabled to give some reflection or shadow of their countenances to their human likenesses of them: otherwise, poetry and philosophy lent their light in vain. It is true, we may magnify the human figure to any extent we please, for that is a mechanical affair; but how we are to add to our ideas of grace or grandeur, beyond any thing we have ever seen, merely by contemplating grace and grandeur that we have never seen, is quite another matter. If we venture beyond the highest point of excellence of which we have any example, we quit our hold of the natural, without being sure that we have laid our hands on what is truly divine; for that has no earthly image or representative—nature

is the only rule or 'legislator.' We may combine existing qualities, but this must be consistently, that is, such as are found combined in nature. Repose was given to the Olympian Jupiter to express majesty; because the greatest power was found to imply repose, and to produce its effects with the least effort. Minerva, the Goddess of Wisdom, was represented young and beautiful; because wisdom was discovered not to be confined to age or ugliness. Not only the individual excellencies, but their bond of union, were sanctioned by the testimony of observation and experience. Bacchus is represented with full, exuberant features, with prominent lips, and a stern brow, as expressing a character of plenitude and bounty, and the tamer of savages and wild beasts. But this *ideal* conception is carried to the brink; the mould is full, and with a very little more straining, it would overflow into caricature and distortion. Mercury has wings, which is merely a grotesque and fanciful combination of known images. Apollo was described by the poets (if not represented by the statuary) with a round jocund face, and golden locks, in allusion to the appearance and rays of the sun. This was an allegory, and would be soon turned to abuse in sculpture or painting. Thus we see how circumscribed and uncertain the province of the *ideal* is, when once it advances from 'the most perfect nature to spirituality and divinity.' We suspect the improved Deity often fell short of the heroic original; and the Venus was only the most beautiful woman of the time, with diminished charms and a finer name added to her. With respect to *ideal* expression, it is superior to common *every-day* expression, no doubt; that is, it must be raised to correspond with lofty characters placed in striking situations; but it is tame and feeble compared with what those characters would exhibit in the supposed circumstances. The expressions in the *Incendio del Borgo* are striking and grand; but could we see the expression of terror in the commonest face in real danger of being burnt to death, it would put all imaginary expressions to shame and flight.

Mr Flaxman makes an attempt to vindicate the golden ornaments, and eyes of precious stones, in the ancient statues, as calculated to add to the awe of the beholder, and inspire a belief in their preternatural power. In this point of view, or as a matter of religious faith, we are not tenacious on the subject, any more than we object to the wonder-working images and moving eyes of the patron saints in Popish churches. But the question, as it regards the fine arts in general, is curious, and treated at some length, and with considerable intricacy and learning, by the Lecturer.

'We certainly know,' he says, 'that the arts of painting and sculp-

ture are different in their essential properties. Painting exists by colours only, and form is the peculiarity of sculpture; but there is a principle common to both, in which both are united, and without which neither can exist—and this is drawing; and in the union of light, shadow, and colour, sculpture may be seen more advantageously by the chill light of a winter's day, or the warmer tints of a midsummer's sun, according to the solemnity or cheerfulness of the subject. These positions will be generally agreed to; but the question before us is, "How far was Phidias successful in adding colours to the sculpture of the Athenian Minerva, and the Olympian Jupiter?"—which examples were followed by succeeding artists.

'We have all been struck by the resemblance of figures in coloured wax-work to persons in fits, and therefore such a representation is particularly proper for the similitude of persons in fits, or the deceased: but the Olympian Jupiter and the Athenian Minerva were intended to represent those who were superior to death and disease. They were believed immortal, and therefore the stillness of these statues, having the colouring of life, during the time the spectator viewed them, would appear divinity in awful abstraction or repose. Their stupendous size alone was preternatural; and the colouring of life without motion increased the sublimity of the statue and the terror of the pious beholder. The effect of the materials which composed these statues has also been questioned. The statues themselves (according to the information of Aristotle, in his book concerning the world) were made of stone, covered with plates of ivory, so fitted together, that at the distance requisite for seeing them, they appeared one mass of ivory, which has much the tint of delicate flesh. The ornaments and garments were enriched with gold, coloured metals, and precious stones.

'Gold ornaments on ivory are equally splendid and harmonious, and in such colossal forms must have added a dazzling glory, like electric fluid running over the surface: the figure, character, and splendour must have had the appearance of an immortal vision in the eyes of the votary.

'But let us attend to the judgment passed on these by the ancients: we have already quoted Quintilian, who says, "they appear to have added something to religion, the work was so worthy of the divinity." Plato says, "the eyes of Minerva were of precious stones," and immediately adds, "Phidias was skilful in beauty." Aristotle calls him "the wise sculptor." An opinion prevailed that Jupiter had revealed himself to Phidias; and the statue is said to have been touched with lightning in approbation of the work. After these testimonies, there seems no doubt remaining of the effect produced by these coloured statues; but the very reasons that prove that colours in sculpture may have the effect of supernatural vision, *fits*, or *death*, prove at the same time that such practice is utterly improper for the general representation of the human figure: *because, as the tints of carnation in nature are consequences of circulation, wherever the colour of flesh is seen without motion, it resembles only death, or a suspension of the vital powers.*

'Let not this application of colours, however, in the instances of the

Jupiter and Minerva, be considered as a mere arbitrary decision of choice or taste in the sculptor, to render his work agreeable in the eyes of the beholder. It was produced by a much higher motive. It was the desire of rendering these stupendous forms\* living and intelligent to the astonished gaze of the votary, and to confound the sceptical by a flash of conviction, that something of divinity resided in the statues themselves.

‘The practice of painting sculpture seems to have been common to most countries, particularly in the early and barbarous states of society. But whether we look on the idols of the South Seas, the Etruscan painted sculpture and *terra-cotta* monuments, or the recumbent coloured statues on tombs of the middle ages, we shall generally find the practice has been employed to enforce superstition, or preserve an exact similitude of the deceased.

‘These, however, are in themselves perverted purposes. The real ends of painting, sculpture, and all the other arts, are to elevate the mind to the contemplation of truth, to give the judgment a rational determination, and to represent such of our fellow-men as have been benefactors to society, not in the deplorable and fallen state of a lifeless and mouldering corpse, but in the full vigour of their faculties when living, or in something corresponding to the state of the good received among the just made perfect.’

All this may be very true and very fine; what the greater part of it has to do with the colouring of statues, we are at a loss to comprehend. Whenever Mr Flaxman gives a reason, it usually makes against himself; but his faith in his conclusion is proof against contradiction. He says, that adding flesh-colour to statues gives an appearance of death to them, *because the colour of life without motion argues a suspension of the vital powers*. The same might be said of pictures which have colour without motion; but who would contend, that because a chalk-drawing has the tints of flesh (denoting circulation) superadded to it, this gives it the appearance of a person in fits, or of death? On the contrary, Sir Joshua Reynolds makes it an objection to coloured statues, that, as well as wax-work, they were too much like life. This was always the scope and ‘but-end’ of his theories and rules on art, that it should avoid coming in too close contact with nature. Still we are not sure that this is not the true reason, *viz.* that the imitation ought not to amount to a deception, nor be effected by gross or identical means. We certainly hate all wax-work, of whatever description; and the idea of colouring a statue gives us a nausea; but as is the case with most bigoted people, the clearness of our reasoning does not keep pace with

---

\* It does not appear that the general form was coloured, as Mr Flaxman seems to argue.

the strength of our prejudices. It is easy to repeat that the object of painting is colour and form, while the object of sculpture is form alone; and to ring the changes on the purity, the severity, the abstract truth of sculpture. The question returns as before; Why should sculpture be more pure, more severe, more abstracted, than any thing else? The only clew we can suggest is, that from the immense pains bestowed in sculpture on mere form, or in giving solidity and permanence, this predominant feeling becomes an exclusive and unsociable one, and the mind rejects every addition of a more fleeting or superficial kind as an excrescence and an impertinence. The form is hewn out of the solid rock; to tint and daub it over with a flimsy, perishable substance, is a mockery and a desecration, where the work itself is likely to last for ever. A statue is the utmost possible development of form; and that on which the whole powers and faculties of the artist have been bent: It has a right then, by the laws of intellectual creation, to stand alone in that simplicity and unsullied nakedness in which it has been wrought. *Tangible form* (the primary idea) is blind, averse to colour. A statue, if it were coloured at all, ought to be inlaid, that is, done in mosaic, where the colour would be part of the solid materials. But this would be an undertaking beyond human strength. Where art has performed all that it can do, why require it to begin its task again? Or if the addition is to be made carelessly and slightly, it is unworthy of the subject. Colour is at best the mask of form: paint on a statue is like paint on a real face,—it is not of a piece with the work, it does not belong to the face, and justly obtains the epithet of *meretricious*.

Mr Flaxman, in comparing the progress of ancient and modern sculpture, does not shrink from doing justice to the latter. He gives the preference to scriptural over classical subjects; and, in one passage, seems half inclined to turn short round on the Greek mythology and morality, and to treat all those Heathen Gods and Goddesses as a set of very improper people:—as to the Roman bas-reliefs, triumphs, and processions, he dismisses them as no better than so many ‘vulgar, military ‘gazettes.’ He, with due doubt and deference, places Michael Angelo almost above the ancients. His statues will not bear out this claim; and we have no sufficient means of judging of their paintings. In his separate groups and figures in the *Sistine Chapel*, there is, we indeed think, a conscious vastness of purpose, a mighty movement, like the breath of Creation upon the waters, that we see in no other works, ancient or modern. The forms of his Prophets and Sibyls are like moulds of *thought*. Mr Flaxman is also strenuous in his praises of the *Last*

*Judgment* ; but on that we shall be silent, as we are not converts to his opinion. Michael Angelo's David and Bacchus, done when he was young, are clumsy and unmeaning ; even the grandeur of his Moses is confined to the horns and beard. The only works of his in sculpture which sustain Mr Flaxman's praise, are those in the chapel of Lorenzo de Medici at Florence ; and these are of undoubted force and beauty.

We shall conclude our extracts with a description of Pisa, the second birth-place of art in modern times ; and in speaking of which, the learned Lecturer has indulged a vein of melancholy enthusiasm, which has the more striking effect as it is rare with him.

'The Cathedral of Pisa, built by Buskettus, an architect from Dulichium, was the second sacred edifice (St Mark's, in Venice, being the first) raised after the destruction of the Roman power in Italy. It has received the honour of being allowed by posterity to have taken the lead in restoring art ; and indeed the traveller, on entering the city gates, is astonished by a scene of architectural magnificence and singularity not to be equalled in the world. Four stupendous structures of white marble in one group—the solemn Cathedral, in the general parallelogram of its form, resembling an ancient temple, which unites and simplifies the arched divisions of its exterior ; the Baptistry, a circular building, surrounded with arches and columns, crowned with niches, statues, and pinnacles, rising to an apex in the centre, terminated by a statue of the Baptist ; the Falling Tower, which is thirteen feet out of the perpendicular, a most elegant cylinder, raised by eight rows of columns surmounting each other, and surrounding a staircase ; the Cemetery, a long square corridor, 400 by 200 feet, containing the ingenious works of the improvers of painting down to the sixteenth century. This extraordinary scene, in the evening of a summer's day, with a splendid red sun setting in a dark-blue sky, the full moon rising in the opposite side, over a city nearly deserted, affects the beholder's mind with such a sensation of magnificence, solitude, and wonder, that he scarcely knows whether he is in this world or not.'

After the glossiness, and splendour, and gorgeous perfection of Grecian art, the whole seems to sink into littleness and insignificance, compared with the interest we feel in the period of its restoration, and in the rude, but mighty efforts, it made to reach to its former height and grandeur ;—with more anxious thoughts, and with a more fearful experience to warn it—with the ruins of the old world crumbling around it, and the new one emerging out of the gloom of Gothic barbarism and ignorance—taught to look from the outspread map of time and change beyond it—and if less critical in nearer objects, commanding a loftier and more extended range, like the bursting the bands of death asunder, or the first dawn of light and peace after darkness and the tempest !



- ART. XIV.—1. *Lärbok i Kemien*. Af Dr J. JAC. BERZELIUS, Chemiæ Professor vid Carolinska, Medico-Chirurgiska Instituteti Stockholm, &c. Stockholm, 1817—1828.
2. *Elements of Practical Chemistry; comprising a Series of Experiments in every Department of Chemistry, with Directions for performing them*. By DAVID BOSWELL REID. 8vo. Edinburgh, 1829.

CHEMISTRY, in a historical point of view, stands quite isolated from the other sciences. It began with pretensions of the most arrogant kind, affirming that it was capable of pointing out a method of changing the baser metals into gold. When this curious fancy started into existence is not accurately known. Suidas, who lived in the tenth century, informs us in his Lexicon, that *Chemistry* (χημια) is the art of making gold and silver; and that many books on it existed in Egypt during the reign of Diocletian, who ordered them to be collected together and burnt, because he was afraid that the Egyptians, by means of them, might become rich, and be induced by their wealth to rebel against the Romans. If we believe the same writer, the *golden fleece*, in search of which Jason and the Argonauts went, was nothing else than a book bound in sheep-skin, which taught the art of making gold.

These passages of Suidas (and they are the earliest we have met with) show sufficiently that, in the tenth century, Chemistry meant the art of making gold. Suidas believed, (and probably this was the general opinion of the time,) that it was well known to the Egyptians during the reign of Diocletian. He even affirms, as just mentioned, that a book on it existed at the period of the Argonautic expedition, or about 1225 years before the beginning of the Christian era. Indeed, it was maintained by the Alchymists, that Chemistry was invented by Hermes Trismegistus, who is considered by Olaus Borrichius as the same with Canaan, the son of Ham, and grandson of Noah. He is said to have engraven the details of the science upon certain pillars, which were left in the custody of the Egyptian priests. But the silence of Herodotus respecting any such chemical pillars, is a sufficient proof that in his time they did not exist. Albertus Magnus, indeed, informs us, that the method of making the philosopher's stone, was engraven by Hermes upon an emerald tablet, which was buried in his tomb, and taken up again by order of Alexander the Great; and a copy of this fabulous tablet has been inserted by Mangetus in the first volume of his *Bibliotheca Chemica Curiosa*.

In the fourth volume of the *Theatricum Chemicum*, there is a treatise by Hermes Trismegistus, entitled *Tractatus Aureus de Lapidis Physici Secreto*. It is divided into seven chapters, and every paragraph is illustrated at considerable length by some anonymous commentator. This tract is a curiosity of its kind. The style is alchymistical, and therefore obscure, or rather unintelligible. But there are evident allusions in it to the literature of the Greeks, and we see clearly enough that the author was an orthodox Christian. The tract is obviously a forgery of some alchymist of the fifteenth century, the great period of alchymistical imposture.

Moses is quoted as an evidence of the chemical skill of the Egyptians. Moses took the golden calf and burnt it in the fire, and ground it to powder, and strewed it upon the water, and made the children of Israel to drink of it.—(Exodus, 32, 20.) Now gold is so ductile that it is very difficult to grind it to powder, and it is still more difficult to dissolve it in water. Here is an exploit which the greatest chemists of the present day could not do more than perform—a sufficient proof of the scientific skill of Moses, and consequently of the Egyptians, from whom he drew his knowledge. But there seems no reason for believing that Moses possessed any chemical knowledge whatever. He broke the calf in pieces, and reduced it to as small fragments as he could; these he threw into water, and made the Israelites drink of that liquid. We are sure that the gold was not dissolved in the water, because gold, in a state of solution, is one of the most virulent of poisons, and could not, therefore, have been administered to the Israelites with impunity.

But though the time at which the alchymistical opinions originated be unknown, we have ample evidence that in the tenth century they were universally entertained; and that, from the tenth to the sixteenth century, the term *Chemistry*, was synonymous with the art of making the philosopher's stone.

So much importance having been attached to Chemistry, and so much power conceded to the skilful practitioner of it, we need not be surprised that it began to be believed, that by means of the alembic and the crucible, remedies might be prepared possessed of the most sovereign virtues,—capable of curing all diseases, and even of restoring old age to the state of youth. When this opinion originated we do not know; but the first person who devoted himself to the preparation of chemical medicines seems to have been Basil Valentine, who is said by Van Helmont to have been a Benedictine monk at Erfurt, and to have lived about the beginning of the fifteenth century. His *Currus triumphalis Antimonii*, which was translated out of the original

German into Latin by Kirkringius, is a work of uncommon merit, infinitely superior to the alchymistical jargon of the age in which the author wrote. In this work he teaches the method of preparing antimonial medicines, which Basil extols as of the most undoubted efficacy. Van Helmont informs us, that Paracelsus, who appeared like a meteor towards the conclusion of the fifteenth century, borrowed most of his opinions, both chemical and medical, from Basil Valentine; though he was not candid enough to acknowledge the source from which he drew them. The prodigious activity of Paracelsus, the arrogance of his style, the scurrility of his invectives, and even his reveries and absurdities, contributed to procure him a reputation, which was altogether unrivalled during his own lifetime. And as he was a zealous cultivator of Chemistry, and extolled chemical medicines to the skies, he threw a lustre upon the science of which it was before destitute; and this must have contributed, in no common degree, to increase the number of chemical medicines and chemical physicians. The invectives of Paracelsus against Galen and Avicenna, and their adherents and disciples, scurrilous and absurd as they are, were probably necessary to rouse the attention of mankind, and to induce medical men to abandon the jargon of the schools, and to apply themselves to anatomy and chemistry; the only true foundations on which a rational medical practice can be built.

The best edition of the works of Paracelsus was published at Geneva, 1658, in three large folio volumes; the first containing the medical treatises, the second the chemical, and the third the surgical. Paracelsus gives, at great length, his views of the origin and causes of diseases, and the proper mode of curing them, not sparing his invectives and coarse sarcasms against his Galenical contemporaries. His opinions, as far as they are intelligible, are quite inconsistent with each other. Nothing can give us a more contemptible idea of the state of medicine in the sixteenth century, than the knowledge, that the writings of Paracelsus constitute an important era in its progress. Astrology, alchymy, and the most abject superstition, form an essential part of his *materia medica*. He is not sparing in his recipes; and dried toads, frogs, serpents, mummies, scarabæi, the dung of pigeons, of dogs, and even still more disgusting preparations, figure among the most efficacious of his remedies. His formulas are excessively complicated, and consist of a far-rago of substances for the most part inert; but we frequently find some one substance, to which the medical reputation which he acquired was probably owing: opium, in some form or other, enters into most of his formulæ, and he seems to have depended

chiefly on it. By it he attempted to cure the gout. His *aurum potabile* contained no gold; but it owed its value, so far as it possessed any, to the tincture of opium, with which it was mixed. If we compare the formulæ of Paracelsus with those of Boyle, published a century and a half later, we will not have much cause to boast of the superiority of the nostrums of our own countryman, above those of the Basil professor.

The second volume of Paracelsus' works contains his chemical and philosophical treatises, in 718 closely-printed folio pages. His chemical writings are decidedly the best part of his works, and show clearly that his knowledge of chemistry was at least equal to that of any of his contemporaries. We consider his treatise on *Minerals* as the most curious of all his works. It contains a list of the mineral substances with which he was acquainted. This very meagre list, had we room to insert it, would probably excite as much surprise in the minds of our readers, as it did in our own the first time that we perused it.

The sixteenth and seventeenth century constitute the golden age of the mathematics, and the sciences depending on calculation; likewise of anatomy; and much attention was paid to experimental investigations. Chemistry, crude as it was, and uncertain as was its object, could not but benefit by the rapid improvements that were taking place in every other branch of science. Bacon explained the true method of investigating nature by induction, and pointed out the importance which chemistry would acquire, so soon as its cultivators endeavoured to increase their knowledge by this *novum organum*. Boyle was the first person who really attempted to prosecute experimental chemistry, and to apply inductive reasoning to the facts which he could collect. He called in question the received doctrine of Basil Valentine, and Paracelsus, that all substances are composed of salt, sulphur, and mercury; and seemed disposed to reject the whole of the dogmas of his predecessors.

The writings of Boyle, joined to those of Hooke and Newton, put an end to alchymy, at least in Great Britain. But the belief in the value of chemical medicines continued to gather strength, notwithstanding the strenuous opposition of the regular physicians of the time. It was about this period that the celebrated sect of Chemical Physicians was in its most flourishing state. Paracelsus may be considered as in some measure its founder. For his physiological opinions, so far as they are intelligible, have an evident leaning to the doctrines of chemistry. But his crude statements were greatly modified and improved by Van Helmont, whose chemical discoveries were numerous and important, and whose physiological theories, considering

the state of medicine when he wrote, are far from contemptible. But De le Boë Sylvius, appointed Professor of Medicine at Leyden in 1658, first reduced chemical medicine into a system, by explaining all the functions upon chemical principles. He was the most popular of professors, Boerhaave alone excepted, and crowds of students flocked to Leyden to imbibe his chemical doctrines.

Chemistry, as a science, contained at that time little more than the term *fermentation*, and the belief in a violent *hostility* perpetually existing between *acid* and *alkali*. It was by fermentation, and by the quarrels and alternate victories of acid and alkali, that the pathology and nature of diseases were explained by Sylvius. It is impossible to conceive a greater bundle of absurdities, or a more erroneous or dangerous practice, than those maintained and followed by the chemical physicians; though the mathematical physicians, who flourished at the same time, were not much behind them in error and absurdity. These two sects gradually destroyed each other; and after the first quarter of the eighteenth century had elapsed, very few supporters of the chemical physiology of Sylvius existed.

But though chemical theory was gradually expelled from the medical schools, the chemical remedies, which had been introduced, did not lose their estimation. Indeed, numerous and most laborious processes had been undertaken in order to increase the number, and improve the value, of chemical medicines.

Thus, about the year 1730, chemistry came to be considered, by the public in general, as nothing else than the art of preparing medicines. The pharmacopœia constituted the codex of the chemist; and the object of the student was to acquire the art of preparing all the medicines contained in the pharmacopœia, or to contrive new, safer, and more efficacious remedies, than those already known. Hence the reason why it constituted an essential part of every medical education. The business of the Professors of Chemistry was to teach medical students the method of preparing the chemical medicines, which they were to employ when they entered upon practice. Since that time, a revolution has taken place both in chemistry and pharmacy; yet the regulations laid down, when both of these branches of science were in their infancy, continue, in this country, to bind both the professors and the students. Medical men do not now prepare their own medicines. Pharmacy has become a separate art, or trade, which those only who are practically initiated in it are competent to carry on. Medicines, in consequence, are both better prepared, and obtained at a cheaper rate, than they would be if

every medical man prepared them for himself. It is necessary that the student should know the nature and properties of the medicines which he is to employ. These are, or ought to be, taught by the Professors of *Materia Medica*. But there is no absolute necessity for his knowing the minutiae of the processes by which these medicines are prepared, any more than there is for the shoemaker to be thoroughly initiated into the craft of the tanner, before he can cut his leather, and convert it into shoes. The business of the Professor of Chemistry is, or ought to be, of a much more important nature. And when he is obliged to mix pharmaceutical formulæ with his chemical prelections, he is acting precisely as if he were to terminate his lectures on iron and steel, with a minute account of the different varieties of horse-shoes, locks, keys, grates, shovels, spades, pickaxes, hammers, and all the other numerous utensils constructed of this indispensable metal.

In this country, chemistry continued to be considered as nearly synonymous with pharmacy, till Dr Cullen began his memorable career in the College of Glasgow, in 1746. He had viewed chemistry with the enlarged eye of a philosopher, and was aware of the importance which it would assume, as soon as it was properly cultivated. He anticipated the splendid career which future chemists would run, and the celebrity which would be attached to their names; and had formed the resolution of devoting himself to it as the most promising of all the sciences. Though Cullen did not adhere to these early resolutions, but afterwards abandoned chemistry for medicine, to which his genius was probably better suited, yet he had the merit of giving a beginning to philosophical chemistry in Great Britain. It was by his lectures that the taste of Dr Black for chemistry was first formed. Dr Black succeeded Cullen, first in Glasgow, and afterwards in Edinburgh; and there can be no doubt that it was Dr Black's lectures which fed the flame that Dr Cullen had kindled.

Dr Black's two great discoveries—the *doctrine of latent heat*, and the *composition of limestone*—led the way to a general investigation of the effects of heat, and to the discovery and description of the different gases. Mr Cavendish and Dr Priestley, indeed, to whom we owe so much for their discoveries respecting the gases, were neither of them pupils of Dr Black. Yet it was undoubtedly his discoveries respecting lime and magnesia, which drew their attention to the subjects which they undertook to investigate. Both Dr Irvine and Dr Crawford, who distinguished themselves so much on the subject of heat, were pupils of Dr Black. And the particular departments of the sub-

ject which they chose to investigate, had been, in some measure, suggested by Dr Black's theory of latent heat.

Thus, about the middle of the eighteenth century, chemistry shook off the trammels of pharmacy, and began to aim at the rank of an independent science. At first her steps were slow and hesitating. The dogmas of the alchymists still clung to her like fetters, and damped all her energies. Beccher and Stahl had forged new chains by their ingenious theory of *combustion*, which was gradually adopted as a first principle, and became the Confession of Faith of the chemists who succeeded them.

The object of chemistry, as soon as it became truly a science, was twofold. 1st, To investigate all the effects of heat, and, if possible, to ascertain the nature of this powerful, but mysterious agent: 2d, To determine the constituents of all the bodies in nature, and make out the number and properties of all the simple bodies which enter into their composition.

1. It was in Great Britain that heat began to be studied as a science. Boyle and Boerhaave, indeed, had laid a kind of foundation; but it was to the two remarkable facts pointed out by Dr Black, that we are chiefly indebted for the structure that has since been reared. He observed, that, when a solid body becomes a fluid, or when a liquid body is converted into vapour, a great deal of heat is absorbed, which is not indicated by the thermometer, and which, therefore, he called *latent*. It had been always known, that when heat is thrown into a body, its temperature rises. And Boerhaave had concluded from an experiment of Fahrenheit, made at his request, and which he minutely describes, that bodies experience the same increase of temperature when equal quantities of heat are thrown into them. But Dr Black drew, from this experiment, exactly the opposite conclusion, and showed from it, that the same quantity of heat has thirty times as much effect in elevating the temperature of mercury, as it has upon the same weight of water. This subject was prosecuted by Dr Irvine and Dr Crawford, who proved, that every substance in nature has a *specific heat* of its own. It was from this property of bodies that Dr Crawford deduced his celebrated theory of animal heat. Mr Watt also investigated several important facts respecting heat, with his accustomed genius and precision.

M. Wilcke, who was Secretary to the Stockholm Academy, published, in its Memoirs for 1772, (just ten years after Black's discovery of latent heat,) a curious paper on the quantity of heat absorbed by snow when it melts. Whether he had derived his first notions of the subject from Dr Black, does not appear; though it is more than probable that he did. In these Memoirs

for 1781, he published a very beautiful set of experiments, by which he investigated the specific heat of ten metals, and likewise of agate and glass. This was about nineteen years after the investigations above mentioned had been begun in Scotland: the publication of the interesting paper on the same subject by Lavoisier and Laplace, was about two years later. There can be no doubt that Lavoisier was well acquainted with what had already been done in Great Britain; though he makes no allusion whatever either to Dr Black, Dr Irvine, or Dr Crawford. This is the more remarkable, because Lavoisier was in the habit of giving a history of what had been previously done upon the particular subject which he was investigating.

Since the commencement of the present century, various other branches of the science of heat have been successfully cultivated. We may mention the *radiation* of heat, so much elucidated by the sagacity of Professor Leslie; the nature of vapour, and the laws of evaporation, and the elasticity of elastic fluids, investigated by Dalton and Gay-Lussac; the laws of cooling, determined by Coulomb and Petit; the specific heat of gases and vapours; the conduction of heat through solids and fluids, the theory of dew, &c. But little or no progress has been yet made in ascertaining the nature of heat, or determining whether it be a substance or a quality.

2. It had been early observed, that many of the substances most familiar to us are not simples, but compounds. Saltpetre, for example, is formed by the union of nitric acid and potash with each other in definite proportions. Nothing can be more unlike than the properties of saltpetre, and of the two substances of which it is composed. It is a cooling bitter-tasted salt, forming six-sided transparent prisms, and having no violent action on animal or vegetable substances; while nitric acid and potash are both of them exceedingly corrosive, destroying at once the texture of most animal and vegetable substances. Chemists endeavoured to determine, by experiment, what substances are simple and what compound; to make out a list of all the simple bodies,—to detect their properties, and to ascertain of what simple bodies every compound substance is constituted.

When Dr Cullen began his chemical career in 1746, the number of *salts* known scarcely amounted to twenty, and of these there was not one whose constituents had been accurately made out. The salts at present known constitute many thousands; and a vast number of them have been investigated with complete accuracy. The other departments of chemistry are not less prolific. There are a great many thousand compounds in the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms, which admit of, and



which require, minute and accurate investigation and analysis. Here was an inexhaustible field, which it was the business of chemists to cultivate. But before mankind could derive much valuable fruit from their labours, Methods of Analysis had to be invented to enable them to separate the constituents of compound bodies from each other; and Processes had to be contrived by means of which the simple substances could be obtained each in an isolated state, and so pure that their properties could be accurately determined.

But at that time the minds of chemists were bound down by the phlogistic theory of Beccher and Stahl, which prevented them from reasoning justly, and of consequence from experimenting accurately. Till they were freed from this intolerable burden, great progress in the prosecution of so extensive a science could not be expected. The number of original thinkers is exceedingly small. In religion, in morals, in politics, and even in science, the generality of mankind are satisfied with the notions which they have imbibed in their infancy. The opinions in which they have been educated become consecrated from that very circumstance. How absurd soever they may be in reality, they cease to be so in their eyes; because they have been accustomed to consider them as first principles which they are not at liberty to reject, or even to call in question. Chemists had been brought up with a belief in the theory of Stahl, and with the habit of viewing it with something like religious veneration. According to Stahl, *combustible* bodies are *compounds*, one of their constituents being *phlogiston*,—a principle common to them all. During combustion, the phlogiston makes its escape, and the other constituents remain behind. Thus, when zinc is heated to redness, it burns with a lively white flame, and a great quantity of a light white tasteless powder remains behind. This shows, according to Stahl, that zinc is a compound of this white matter (*calx of zinc*) and phlogiston. Accordingly, to produce zinc again we have only to unite the calx of zinc with a sufficient quantity of phlogiston. Now, it happens, that all the simple bodies are capable of undergoing *combustion*, or at least of some analogous process. All the simple substances, according to Stahl's theory, are compounds, and they all contain a common principle, *phlogiston*. It was requisite to examine the truth of this opinion with impartiality, before any real progress could be made in the difficult art of analysis.

All metals, according to the Stahlian theory, are compounds of a calx and phlogiston; and when a metal is burnt, the phlogiston flies off, and the calx remains. Now it was very early discovered, that when a metal has undergone combustion, the

calx which remains is heavier than the metal was before it was burnt. If  $42\frac{1}{2}$  grains of zinc be burnt, the residuary calx will weigh  $52\frac{1}{2}$  grains. When we heat  $72\frac{1}{2}$  grains of tin in the same way, the weight becomes  $82\frac{1}{2}$  grains. This last fact was observed by Boyle, who concluded from it, that *fire* may be fixed in bodies, and that fire is not destitute of weight. But after the discoveries of Dr Black and others, this opinion became untenable. Did chemists in consequence give up the doctrine of phlogiston? No: they refined upon it, and deduced from this and other similar facts, the conclusion, that phlogiston is not merely destitute of weight, but actually endowed with a principle of levity. The palpable inconsistency between this opinion and the admitted fact, that phlogiston possesses the property of combining with the calxes of metals, and of remaining united to them, did not appear to have struck them. To say that a body is destitute of weight, or possessed of levity, is the same thing as to say that it does not attract, or that it repels, ponderable bodies. But if so, how comes it to combine with substances for which it has, not only no attraction, but actually a repulsion?

These difficulties and inconsistencies had no effect upon the chemical theories of the time. Even the necessity of air for the support of combustion, which had been always known, and which had induced Dr Hooke to form a very different theory of combustion, was either neglected or explained away.

The overturning of the Stahl theory was reserved for Lavoisier, who performed it after a most laborious investigation, which occupied him ten years. He demonstrated that combustion is not a *decomposition*, as had been hitherto supposed, but a *combination*. In common cases, the combustible unites with oxygen, one of the two constituents of common air. Hence the necessity of air for combustion, and hence the reason why the product of combustion is heavier than the combustible from which it was formed. Lavoisier availed himself of the numerous and important discoveries of Cavendish, Priestley, and Scheele, which he verified; while his own experiments were conducted with a degree of care and precision, and at an expense, hitherto unknown. He demonstrated that charcoal, when burnt, combines with oxygen, and is converted into carbonic acid; that sulphur, by uniting to oxygen, becomes sulphurous acid; and that the calces of mercury, iron, and tin, and all the metallic calces, are combinations of the respective metals and oxygens. And Mr Cavendish showed that hydrogen, when burnt, unites to oxygen, and becomes *water*; and that azote, by uniting to oxygen, becomes *nitric acid*.

Any person, who is not aware of the hold which favourite systems have upon men of science, as well as the vulgar, would be surprised that Lavoisier's Papers, numerous and conclusive as they are, produced so little effect upon his contemporaries. He experimented, and demonstrated, and published for ten years, without making a single convert. Every chemist opposed him in every country. And it is humiliating to be obliged to acknowledge, that his final success was not owing so much to the goodness of his cause, as to his address in enlisting the vanity and nationality of his countrymen on his side. The older chemists, indeed, in every country (with a few remarkable exceptions) continued to the last faithful to the doctrine of phlogiston; but the young men in every nation embraced the new doctrines of the French chemist.

Thus Lavoisier had the rare merit of completely eradicating the leaven of alchymy, which, till his time, continuing kneaded with chemistry, had polluted the whole mass. He set the votaries of the science at complete liberty; the materials for thinking and experimenting were laid before them; and they were enabled to exercise their own judgments, without being insensibly warped by preconceived opinions. This was the service which Lavoisier performed; and it was one of the most important description. Most of his peculiar theories and opinions, plausible and seducing as they were, have been subsequently shown to be erroneous. But the sweeping away of all old prejudices and trammels immediately produced, and still continues to produce, the most important effects. The number of working chemists was greatly multiplied, and their activity proportionally increased; the method of investigating nature became better understood, and the science was augmented by a thousand rills flowing into it from as many different quarters.

It was only after the demolition of the Stahlia theory, that accurate rules for investigating the constitution of compound bodies could be devised. Margraaf had, indeed, begun the investigation about the middle of the last century, and had made analyses, which, considered as first attempts, were by no means contemptible. About twenty years later, Bergman devoted the whole of his attention to the improvement of the analytical art. He examined various mineral waters, and gave a minute detail of the methods by which he determined the constituents of each. He attempted to analyse the precious stones, and drew up a set of rules for analysing mineral bodies in general. So much confidence was placed in his accuracy, that his determinations of the composition of salts were long taken as the data from which chemists calculated the results of their analyses. About the same

time, Scheele applied his wonderful powers to the same subject; and the skill with which he investigated the constitution of several bodies till then unknown, is truly astonishing.

But it was Klaproth who first reduced the art of analysis to general principles, and who laid such a great number of examples before the public, that others were enabled, by studying his writings, to acquire the same kind of skill. It was thus that the methods of analysis became generally known. In the six volumes of his *Beitrage*, he has given a minute detail of no fewer than 374 different analyses, mostly of mineral substances; though vegetable, and even animal substances, were not entirely neglected by him. Next to Klaproth, analytical chemistry is most indebted to Vauquelin. He was led early to turn his attention to the subject from his connexion with the *School of Mines*, and the great number of minerals which were in consequence referred to him for chemical investigation. He systematized the art of analysis, and published a minute detail of the methods which he followed. This art is also indebted to Dr Wollaston, for several important improvements. He brought platinum vessels into general use, without which, accurate experimenting would be nearly impossible. He introduced the method of experimenting upon a small scale, which not only saves much time and expense, but is much more accurate than the old way of working upon large quantities.

Meanwhile, another branch of analysis was proceeding with alacrity, and the fixed alkalies and earths, hitherto deemed simple, were shown to be compounds of oxygen and metals. For this purpose the Voltaic battery was employed by Davy, who rendered his name immortal by a brilliant train of most important discoveries. With these commenced a new and more accurate era of experimenting; and the nature and properties of the various simple substances, and their numerous compounds, were investigated with much zeal, sagacity, and success. Davy and Gay-Lussac were the most conspicuous and successful in the new career which the former opened.

In the year 1792, Richter published at Breslau a small volume, entitled, *Elements of Stoichiometry, or the Geometry of the Chemical Elements*. This was continued in 1793 and 1794; and afterwards at various intervals, under another name, till the year 1802. These publications, owing, probably, to the little attraction in the style—to the mathematical calculations with which they are interspersed—and to the want of rigid accuracy in the experiments, drew but little attention from chemists. Berthollet, indeed, speaks of the opinions of Richter with approbation in his *Chemical Statics*; but probably he was not aware

that they were inconsistent with his own views respecting the nature of chemical attraction. Richter had observed, that when two salts, capable of mutually decomposing each other, are mixed together, the two new salts formed are commonly as neutral as the old ones. Suppose the two salts to be sulphate of soda, and nitrate of barytes, and that we employ such quantities of each that these two salts are completely converted into sulphate of barytes and nitrate of soda; there will be no excess either of acid or base. But this could not happen, unless the quantity of sulphuric acid united to the soda were just capable of saturating the barytes united to the nitric acid, and unless the nitric acid, united to the barytes, were just capable of saturating the soda united to the sulphuric acid. Now, as this holds with all the acids and bases, it follows from it, that a number may be attached to every acid and base, representing the weight of acid capable of saturating weights of each base represented by the number attached to it; and the weight of base capable of saturating the weights of each acid represented by the number attached to it. The following little table shows the numbers belonging to the principal acids and bases, according to the experiments of Richter :—

Alumina . . .	525	Fluoric acid . . .	427
Magnesia . . .	615	Carbonic acid . . .	577
Ammonia . . .	672	Muriatic . . .	712
Lime . . .	793	Oxalic . . .	755
Soda . . .	859	Phosphoric . . .	979
Strontian . . .	1326	Sulphuric . . .	1000
Potash . . .	1605	Succinic . . .	1209
Barytes . . .	2222	Nitric . . .	1405
		Acetic . . .	1480
		Citric . . .	1683
		Tartaric . . .	1694

According to this table, 525 grains of alumina saturate 427 grains of fluoric acid; 1000 of sulphuric, 1405 of nitric; and the weight of every other acid represented by the number attached to it. In like manner, 1000 grains of sulphuric acid saturate 859 grains of soda; 1605 of potash, and the weight of each of the other bases represented by the number attached to it.

Unfortunately these numbers, derived from Richter's experiments, are not accurate; and the author indulged in some fanciful notions respecting the figurate numbers. This might have contributed to the almost unaccountable neglect which his opinions met with from the whole of his own countrymen.

About the year 1803, the subject of chemical combination drew the attention of Mr Dalton, one of the most original thinkers of modern times. His attention was arrested by the way in

which oxygen unites with simple bodies. With some it combines only in one proportion; with a great many in two; and with several in three, four, or even six proportions. Now, he observed, that if we take a given weight of a simple body, capable of uniting with oxygen in more than one proportion, and determine the quantity of oxygen requisite to constitute that compound which contains the smallest quantity of that principle, the oxygen in the second compound will be obtained by multiplying that in the first by two; the oxygen in the third compound by multiplying that in the first by three, and so on. Thus, carbon unites to oxygen in two proportions, forming carbonic oxide and carbonic acid. Let us take six parts of carbon:—

Carbonic oxide is formed of 6 carbon	+ 8 oxygen
Carbonic acid ditto 6	+ 8 × 2 = 16

Sulphur unites to oxygen in three proportions, forming hyposulphurous, sulphurous, and sulphuric acids. Let us take 16 parts of sulphur; then—

Hyposulphurous acid is 16 sulphur	+ 8 oxygen
Sulphurous acid 16	+ 8 × 2 = 16
Sulphuric acid 16	+ 8 × 3 = 24 oxygen.

Azote combines with five proportions of oxygen. Taking 14 of azote, these five compounds may be represented as follows:—

Protoxide of azote, composed of 14 azote	+ 8 oxygen
Deutoxide of azote 14	+ 8 × 2 = 16
Hyponitrous acid 14	+ 8 × 3 = 24
Nitrous acid 14	+ 8 × 4 = 32
Nitric acid 14	+ 8 × 5 = 40

Mr Dalton explained this law in the following manner:—Every simple substance is composed ultimately of particles incapable of farther division; to which, therefore, he gave the name of *atoms*. It is the atoms alone that enter into chemical combination with each other. One atom of one body may unite with one atom of another, or with two atoms, or with a greater number. The atom of every body has a peculiar weight, discoverable by the proportions in which it enters into combination with other bodies. Thus it is obvious, that the weights of the atoms of carbon and oxygen are to each other as the numbers 6 to 8, or 3 to 4. If the atom of oxygen be eight, that of carbon will be six. We see from the other examples, that if an atom of oxygen weigh eight, that of sulphur will be sixteen, and that of azote fourteen. So that an atom of sulphur is just twice as heavy as an atom of oxygen.

Mr Dalton saw at once the importance of determining the numbers representing the weights of the atoms of bodies. In the first volume of his *Chemical Philosophy*, published in 1808, he gave a catalogue of most of the simple bodies, and of the most

remarkable compounds; to each of which he attached the number which he considered as representing its atomic weight—assuming that of hydrogen to be unity. But these numbers are unfortunately far from near approximations to the truth. In the year 1808, very few accurate determinations of the true composition of compound bodies existed. And Mr Dalton himself neither possessed the requisite chemical skill, nor the means of making accurate experiments on the subject. In his succeeding volumes he has endeavoured to correct the mistakes into which he had fallen. But his numbers, even with his last corrections, are still very wide of the truth.

In the year 1808, Professor Berzelius, of Stockholm, published the first volume of the first edition of his system of Chemistry. While engaged in drawing it up, he had occasion to peruse a number of chemical books. Among others, he read with attention the *Stoichiometry* of Richter. He was naturally much struck with the idea which Richter started and prosecuted, that numbers may be affixed to each acid and base, denoting the weights of each which reciprocally saturate each other. The opinion itself appeared likely to be true; but the numbers of Richter were obviously inaccurate. Berzelius undertook the arduous task of making a new set of experiments, in order to put the truth or inaccuracy of Richter's theory beyond doubt. This task was difficult. The number of experiments requisite was immense. Precise methods of analysis had to be invented; and there was nothing at hand to check the experimenter, or to warn him when he deviated from the truth.

He began by analysing the neutral salts, containing the most important acids and bases; and by dint of frequent repetitions,—by varying the methods of the process, and by trying whether the weights of the constituents obtained, when again united, would constitute salts as neutral as those subjected to analysis, and by not considering his analysis as accurate till he had obtained this ultimate test of accuracy,—he was able at last to arrive at numbers exceedingly near the truth. The first Paper on the subject was published by him in 1810, in the third volume of the *Afhandlingar*; a periodical work by Hisinger and Berzelius, of which six volumes in all were published at Stockholm. This Paper contained the determination of the composition of thirty-three compound bodies; determined with a degree of precision which exceeded every thing of the kind hitherto exhibited in chemistry. But this laborious investigation having been given to the world in the Swedish language, remained unknown to chemists in general, till an abstract of it was published in the *Annales de Chemie*, in a letter from Berzelius to Berthollet, in

the year 1811. During the years 1812 and 1813, a translation of the original paper, by Vogel, was inserted in that publication.

While engaged in these investigations, Mr Dalton's Atomic Theory became known to him. This induced him to extend his researches to simple substances, and their more immediate combinations, as well as to acids and bases. No one who is not conversant with the practical details of chemistry, can have any conception of the immense labour which this undertaking implied. It seems to have occupied Berzelius almost day and night for a period of five or six years. But the importance of the results obtained was a full compensation for the labour incurred. He not only established the opinion of Richter beyond the reach of controversy, but demonstrated also the truth of Dalton's theory; and proved, to the satisfaction of every competent judge, that chemical substances never combine except in definite proportions. These first analyses of Berzelius were resumed by him again and again, and extended still farther; till he was at last enabled, about the year 1817, to publish a table of all the simple substances, and a numerous set of compounds, (including all the acids and bases,) with the atomic weight attached to each. He denoted the atom of oxygen by 100, which was his unity, and to this he referred the atomic weights of all other substances.

During these investigations, Berzelius conceived that he discovered certain general principles which regulate all the combinations into which compound bodies enter. These he gave under the name of the *general laws of combination*. The most important of them are the following:—

1. Where an acid and a base unite, the oxygen in the acid is a multiple of that in the base by 1, 2, 3, &c. The only exceptions to this law exist in the combinations of phosphoric, arsenic, and nitric acids with bases.

2. Oxides, containing only one atom of oxygen, united to one atom of base, have very weak affinities for acids.

3. Oxides, with two atoms oxygen, have a very strong affinity for acids.

4. Oxides, with three atoms oxygen, have weak affinities for acids. Some of them possess rather the properties of acids than bases.

5. Most acids contain three atoms of oxygen, but some contain 2, 4, 5, 6, 8 atoms.

It was through these arbitrary maxims, established at an early period of his career, that he looked at the constitution of compound bodies; and they have led him to a system exceedingly complicated and perplexing. The third maxim made him con-



sider all the bases as compounds of one atom of metal and two atoms of oxygen. Nothing is rarer than to find, in his system, one atom of one body united with one atom of another. Nature, in his opinion, delights in complex combinations; nothing simple or easy seems to please her. All the neutral salts are compounds of one atom of base with two atoms of acid. Those salts which have alkaline properties are compounds of *one* atom of base with *one* atom of acid; while those that have acid properties, are compounds of one atom base with four atoms, or sometimes with eight atoms, of acid. It is a very rare thing to find one atom of a metal combined with one atom of sulphur. It is generally united to two, three, four, or sometimes to twelve or sixteen atoms of sulphur.

When we contemplate this most complicated system, we cannot but be struck with the ingenuity of Berzelius, who has contrived, at the expense of much labour and time, to make all the parts of it agree harmoniously with each other; so that the atomic numbers deduced from it represent, very nearly indeed, the ratios of the atoms to each other. Hence, though these numbers are inconveniently large, being always five and often six figures deep, yet they may be used with confidence to calculate the results of our chemical analyses. But it is very unlikely that so complicated and involved a system should be a true representation of the way in which atoms combine with each other. Nature delights in simplicity, and therefore there is every reason to expect that she will have made choice of the simplest and easiest laws for combination. The elementary compositions, which constitute the materials of which our globe is composed, are doubtless regulated by laws equally simple as those which determine the motions of the solar system. Ptolemy, by an endless series of cycles and epicycles, one within the other, contrived to represent those motions so that the positions of the heavenly bodies might be calculated with tolerable accuracy. But that complicated system was far from representing the true theory of the motions of those bodies. That this is also the case with the theory of Berzelius, and that it will follow the fate of the Ptolemaic system, may be asserted without any charge of presumption. Truth is simple and one; errors are infinite.

Fortunately the chemists of Great Britain have followed a much simpler plan than that which guided Berzelius. Dalton laid it down as an axiom, that when two bodies unite only in one proportion, we ought to consider the compound as constituted of an atom of each, unless there be some reason for a contrary conclusion; and that, when a salt is *neutral*, or possessed neither of acid nor of alkaline properties, it is a compound of

one atom of acid and one atom of base. These axioms have been adopted by the British chemists in all their investigations. Dr Prout, in a very elaborate and ingenious paper, published in 1815, (*Annals of Philosophy*, vol. vi.) endeavoured to show, that the atoms of all other bodies are multiples of the atomic weight of hydrogen. Hence, if we make the atom of hydrogen unity, that of every other body will be a whole number.

Dr Thomson undertook a laborious investigation of the atomic weights of bodies, guided by facts which had been established as early as the time of Wenzel. His method was to decompose a salt containing each acid and each base, by double decomposition; and in this way to determine the atomic weight of each, if not with mathematical accuracy, still within limits so narrow, that the error must be wholly insignificant. The determination of the atomic weights of all those simple bodies which are capable of assuming the gaseous state, was deduced from the specific gravity of the gases, which he determined with very great care; and from Gay-Lussac's Theory of Volumes, respecting the truth of which no doubt whatever can exist. He subjected above three hundred different salts to analysis; besides numerous analyses of the oxides and sulphurets, and some other classes of compounds. These investigations confirmed the view already given by Prout; for he found most atoms multiples of twice the weight of hydrogen; so that, if hydrogen be represented by one, that of most others will constitute an even number. To this law there is no exception among simple bodies. And those compounds only constitute exceptions, which contain either one atom, or an odd number of atoms, of hydrogen.

Such is a sketch of the progress of Chemistry during about eighty years—for to that short period must we limit its history as a Science. Let us see what it amounts to. The simple substances at present known, (exclusive of light, heat, electricity, and magnetism,) constitute fifty. By the union of these fifty bodies with each other, all the compounds of which the globe consists, are formed. They do not unite with each other any way, but only in definite proportions; and numbers have been affixed to all of them, representing the weight of each, which enters into combination with a given weight of every other. Four of these simple bodies are gaseous,—oxygen, hydrogen, azote, and chlorine. Two are liquid,—bromine and mercury; the remaining forty-four are solid bodies. Six of these last are destitute of the metallic lustre, and non-conductors of electricity: these are carbon, boron, silicon, phosphorus, sulphur, and selenium. The remaining thirty-eight are metals.

All the simple substances are capable of uniting to oxygen,

some in only one, but the greater number in at least two proportions: twenty-five of them, when united to oxygen, constitute the substances which we call *bases* or *alkalies*; fifteen of them, when united to oxygen, constitute *acids*. A great proportion of the most familiar substances consist of acids and bases united together. The rocks or stones, which constitute as it were the bones of the earth, consist chiefly of two acids, viz.—*silica* and *carbonic acid* united to *lime* or *magnesia*, or *alumina*, or *oxide of iron*, or *potash*, or *soda*. Thus lime-stone is a compound of carbonic acid and lime. Granite consists of *quartz*, *felspar*, and *mica crystals*. Quartz is merely the acid called *silica* in a state of aggregation. Felspar is a double salt composed of

4 atoms tersilicate of alumina,

1 atom tersilicate of potash.

Mica is a triple salt, composed of three simple silicates, as follows:—

6 atoms silicate of alumina,

2 atoms silicate of lithia,

1 atom silicate of potash.

With equal simplicity might the constitution of all stony bodies be exhibited.

In like manner, *soap* is a compound of one atom of *potash* or *soda*, with one atom of *oleic* or *margaric acid*. *Brass* is a definite compound of *copper* and *zinc*. *Steel* and *cast-iron* are definite compounds of *iron* and *carbon*. *Alcohol* and *sugar* are definite compounds of *oxygen*, *carbon*, and *hydrogen*. A similar remark will apply to all compounds, whether mineral, vegetable, or animal; they are all definite compounds of two or more simple substances with each other.

But a vast number of the definite compounds, which these simple bodies are capable of forming, remain still unknown. Most acids and bases seem capable of combining in at least four proportions; though (a few cases excepted) only one of these four compounds has been examined. The twenty-five alkaline bases become alkalies likewise when they combine with sulphur, selenium, tellurium, &c.; and the fifteen acid bases become acids by uniting with any of the same bodies. Thus there are many classes of acids, namely, oxygen acids, sulphur acids, selenium acids, tellurium acids, &c. There are as many classes of bases. Now, each of these classes of acids is capable of forming salts with the corresponding alkaline class. Hitherto only a portion of the oxygen salts has been examined; all the sulphur, selenium, tellurium salts, &c. still present untrodden ground.

Every chemical manufactory consists merely in the formation

or decomposition of definite compounds. Every step which we make in the knowledge of these definite compounds, leads to a corresponding improvement in the manufactory. It is owing to the progress which Chemistry has made of late years, that so many important improvements have been introduced into all our manufactures. As the science advances, many new manufactories, of which we have no idea at present, will start into existence. The time may come when sugar, starch, and gum, and many similar substances, may be manufactured by uniting their constituents, as soap is made at present. Even fat, wax, albumen, and glue, may, hereafter, be made artificially.

In short, the progress of chemistry seems unbounded. Could we suppose it brought to perfection, how different would the state of society become! Mankind would be in some measure independent of climate and season: every thing might be produced in every possible situation. A familiar example will serve as an illustration.

Before the middle of the last century, the business of bleaching was in the hands of the Dutch. The Scottish manufacturers were in the habit of sending their goods to Holland, and they received them back after an interval of about nine months. About the year 1760, Dr Home of Edinburgh proposed to substitute sulphuric acid for the sour milk which had been hitherto used by the Dutch bleachers. The suggestion was acted upon, and the consequence was, the immediate reduction of the time of bleaching from nine months to three. About the end of the last century, chlorine began to be substituted for exposure to the sun on the grass; and this substitution, after much laborious investigation, has been brought to a state of perfection. The most extensive Bleaching Houses in Glasgow are now situated in narrow lanes, where neither sun nor grass is to be met with; and it is no uncommon thing to receive unbleached goods on the morning of one day, and to return them bleached and ready for the market on the evening of the next! Similar ameliorations will doubtless be introduced hereafter into other manufactures. We have only, indeed, to contemplate our streets illuminated with gas, and the almost omnipotent powers of steam, to be aware of the deep obligations under which we lie to this eminently important science.

All that is wanting is a sufficient number of labourers to carry it to perfection. The field is so vast, that one man is able to do but little. It must be cultivated by a multitude, otherwise it will remain barren and unproductive. Yet, strange as it may appear, the number of working chemists in this country, instead of increasing, has been wofully diminishing. About

twenty-five years ago, at least thirty individuals might have been reckoned in Great Britain actively employed in chemical investigations; now, we can scarcely reckon ten. Some cause must exist for this retrogradation, so different from what is exhibited on the Continent, especially in France and in Germany. It must be ascribed, we fear, to the way in which the science has been hitherto taught in this country, namely, by lectures only, with illustrative experiments. Our Universities, however, have begun to perceive, that in order to form chemists, something more is necessary; that the student must have the means of practical instruction in the details of analysis, and all the operations of the Laboratory; in other words, that he must have the means of acquiring the art of experimental chemistry by regulated practice. Classes for instruction in Practical Chemistry have, accordingly, been lately instituted in the Universities both of Edinburgh and Glasgow; and from those, if properly supported and conducted, it is reasonable to anticipate the most beneficial results.

The utility of such practical instruction has been long felt and acted upon abroad. There are several Practical Schools of chemistry in Paris. Berthier takes twenty practical pupils at the *Ecole des Mines*. Vauquelin takes several; so does Laugier; not to mention Robiquet, and various other apothecaries, who possess the knowledge of the practical details of chemistry in perfection. Stromeyer has long taught a practical class at Göttingen. Berzelius has done the same at Stockholm, where various excellent analytical chemists have been educated.

No nation in Europe has made a greater figure in chemistry than Britain. The number and importance of her discoveries will bear a comparison with those of any other country whatever. But the nature of the science has been so much altered by the discovery of the Atomic Theory,—the minute accuracy now necessary for experimenting is so great, that genius alone, without practical skill, cannot be expected to succeed. We therefore hope that the business of practical instruction will be vigorously prosecuted and extended in all our great Seminaries. If it shall be otherwise, Britain must, we fear, descend from her eminence in chemical science, and be content to receive from others that information and instruction which she was wont to communicate from her own stores.

ART. XV.—*A Letter Addressed to the Earl of Aberdeen, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.* By HENRY GALLY KNIGHT, Esq. London. 1829.

**T**HIS Letter appears to be written without any party motive, and merely to give vent to the strong feelings of regret which were excited in the author's mind, by comparing the estimation he had seen his country held in, when he visited the Continent in 1828, and in the present year. 'The pride and the pleasure which I had before experienced,' he says, 'were changed into other emotions. England was no longer the object of universal approbation—she was no longer considered as the enlightened advocate of liberal principles abroad; she was accused of having joined the party which is opposed to the cause of freedom; and this at the very time when her home policy was conducted in a manner which deserved and received the highest praise. Was it possible for an Englishman to witness so remarkable a change in the estimation in which his country was held, without feelings of the deepest mortification?'

That such an opinion prevails, not only in France, but in Italy and Germany, we have the best reason to believe: But we cannot bring ourselves to think that there is any foundation for the charge of our once more joining the worn-out despotism of the Continent, patronizing the narrow and hateful principles of less enlightened ages, and opposing the desire of rational and constitutional liberty, which, except among the rabble of Lisbon and Madrid, may be said to prevail universally among the people of Europe, from one end of it to the other. If, unhappily, it should be found that we are mistaken, assuredly it will well become the body of the community in this country to let their disapproval of such courses be clearly manifested, in order that we may not be once more punished for the faults of our rulers. For, one thing is quite certain: the French nation, with whom it is our highest interest to be on friendly terms, feel almost as one man upon these subjects; and, as the opinion and wish of an immense majority of Great Britain and Ireland coincides with them, nothing can possibly tend more to perpetuate peace between the two countries, than preserving the relations of kindness between the inhabitants at large of both—and nothing could happen more likely to endanger those pacific relations, than the prevalence of a belief that the English government represented the sentiments of the people, when it evinced, if it ever should evince, any disposition to resume the policy of 1818 and 1821.

In this point of view, it must be a matter of unfeigned regret to every lover of his country, whether he regards her honour or her interests, that an opinion should have become prevalent of the English government having exerted its influence to recommend the formation of the present strange and incomprehensible Ministry in France. That any men of ordinary sagacity should ever have dreamt of encouraging so wild a speculation, is wholly incredible. Our government may have been desirous to see some change in the French administration ; but such a change as was effected, no person in his senses could wish for. But we are rather anxious to vindicate the country than its rulers ; and certainly, though the people of France might more quickly perceive the outrage offered to them, and more deeply resent it, because they, of course, knew more intimately the materials of which the new cabinet was composed, yet was the astonishment at this strange sight nearly as universal in England ; and there is hardly a difference, either of opinion or of wish, respecting the fate of the rash experiment which has been made upon the patience of our neighbours. It would be doing the greatest injustice to the well-informed part of the community, if the French people were to imagine, because of the singular language held by some few liberal journals amongst us, that there really exists any difference between the popular feeling on the opposite sides of the Channel. A hearty contempt for the new Ministry—a deep indignation at the unprincipled conduct of these intriguers, the meanness of whose capacity forms so striking a contrast with the temerity of their projects—an earnest wish to see the scheme signally defeated—but, above all, an anxious hope that this may be effected without peril to the internal tranquillity of France, or her peaceful intercourse with her neighbours—these sentiments, beyond a doubt, prevail among all the better part of the people here ; and, we fondly trust, are only shared with the bulk of the community in that great and enlightened country.

The history of the event to which we are alluding appears as plain as any thing can be, which is, to a certain degree, involved in the mystery of court intrigue. The Ultra-Royalist and Priest Party, having unhappily the ear of the French King, persuaded him to form an administration which should act in accordance with their views. Belonging to that class of whom Talleyrand as wisely as wittily remarked, that they had neither learned any thing, nor forgotten any thing, since the emigration, these advisers of the Crown lived in the centre of Paris,—its meetings, its chambers, its coteries, its journals, with as little idea of all that was passing around them, as if they had been buried in the darkness and silence of a monastery, or cut off, by physical defects, from inter-

course with the living world. The only point to be gained, they fancied, was the King's consent to make a cabinet to their liking. The feeling and opinion of the country they no more dreamt of consulting, than if they had lived in Turkey. They did carry their object; and were first awakened to a sense of the position into which they had brought the King and the dynasty, by the burst of indignation that resounded from every part of France, and has already shaken the whole establishment of the state. The Court may possibly have the tardy wisdom to avoid bringing on a crisis by persisting in this hazardous attempt; and then it will only have weakened its influence, and rendered the formation of a liberal government upon moderate principles more difficult. If it perseveres in its present course, a signal discomfiture in the Chambers awaits it, and a far more wide-spreading change may be expected to result from the delay.

We have expressed our unfeigned disbelief of the rumours which ascribe the formation of this new Ministry to any influence exerted by the English government. It seems wholly impossible that our Ministers should have regarded it with any but feelings of alarm for the peace both of France and of Europe. But the impression which prevails among our neighbours is unfortunately very different; and it behoves our rulers to lose no time in disclaiming all share in the bad work which has excited such just indignation. Indeed, any interference whatever on their part would have been unpardonable. What have they to do with the changes of French Ministers? What change effected by their interference, or under their advice, could, in the present temper of the French people, prove otherwise than hateful? Even the establishment of a liberal Ministry, or a Ministry in all other respects popular, would almost of necessity become suspicious in the eyes of the nation, if it was believed to have been brought about by English influence. Such irritation may subside in a little time; but till then, the Minister who intermeddles with the *Cabinet-making* of the Tuileries, endangers that dear-bought peace, the conservation of which is the first, and middle, and last of his duties towards his country. And even after all sore and angry feelings shall have been worn out, the only safe and honourable course for our government will always be, to stand aloof from the court intrigues and domestic factions of our neighbours, and to pursue the line of conduct which may best tend to promote a friendly spirit between the two nations.

We had intended to go more at large into this most important subject; but we find that we have neither time nor space left to pursue it farther at present. We would fain hope, indeed, that it may never be necessary to resume it; and that we may soon be



enabled to refer to explicit declarations, or overt acts, on the part of our government, of such a nature as to put down effectually the accusations to which we have alluded : And in the meantime we trust that no opportunity will be lost by those who have the means of collecting and reporting the public feeling and opinion, to confirm and repeat the testimony we have now ventured to give as to its true character and direction in the quarters to which we have access.

*No. C. will be published in January.*

# QUARTERLY LIST NEW PUBLICATIONS,

*From June to September, 1829.*

## ARCHITECTURE, ANTIQUITIES, AND FINE ARTS.

Illustrations of the Literary Souvenir. India Proofs, Imperial 4to, 1*l.* 10*s.*; before letters, colombier, in portfolio, 3*l.* 3*s.*

Britton's Picturesque Antiquities of English Cities. No. IV. 4to, 1*l.* 4*s.*; Imperial 4to, 2*l.*

———— Architectural Antiquities. Parts XI. and XII. 4to, 2*l.* 8*s.* each, bds.

Bloxam's Gothic Architecture. 12mo. 4*s.* bds.

Bell's Gothic Architecture of Ireland. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* bds.

Illustrations of Friendship's Offering. India Proofs, before letters, 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*; Prints, 1*l.* 1*s.*; French Proofs, 15*s.*

———— of the Iris. India paper, colombier, 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*; French paper, 1*l.* 4*s.*

———— of the Amulet, 1*l.* 10*s.*; before letters, 2*l.* 10*s.*

———— of the Keepsake, 1830. Proofs, colombier, 2*l.* 2*s.*; India Proofs, 3*l.* 3*s.*; before letters, 4*l.* 4*s.*; Proofs and Etchings, 5*l.* 5*s.*

———— of the Winter's Wreath. French paper, 18*s.*

Rutter's Delineations of the North-Western Division of Somerset, 8vo, 15*s.*; Royal 8vo, 1*l.* 1*s.*; Proofs, India, royal 8vo, 1*l.* 10*s.*; Demy 4to, 2*l.* 2*s.* bds.

Illustrations to the Landscape Annual. Proofs, colombier 4to, 2*l.* 2*s.*; India Proofs, 3*l.* 3*s.*; before letters, 4*l.* 4*s.*; Proofs and Etchings, 5*l.* 5*s.*

## ARITHMETIC.

Wright's Self-Instructions in Pure Arithmetic. 8vo. 8*s.* bds.

## BIOGRAPHY.

Hosack's Memoirs of De Witt Clinton. 4to. 2*l.* 2*s.* bds.

Turner's (Sir James) Memoirs. 4to. 1*l.* 15*s.* bds.

Ballanic's Memoirs. 12mo. 5*s.* bds.

Some Account of the Life of Reginald Heber. 18mo. 5*s.* bds.

Vidocq's Memoirs. 4 vols. 18mo, 14*s.*; Royal 18mo, 1*l.* 4*s.* bds.

Doddridge's Correspondence and Diary. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 10*s.* bds.

## BOTANY.

Smith's Compendium of the English Flora, translated into English. 12mo. 7*s.* 6*d.* bds.

Jones and Kingston's Flora Devoniensis. 8vo. 16*s.* bds.

Johnston's Flora of Berwick-upon-Tweed. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d. bds.

Sanders' Select Florist. 12mo. 2s. 6d. bds.

Smith's Catalogue of rare Plants in South Kent. 8vo. 5s. sewed.

#### DOMESTIC ECONOMY

Vegetable Cookery. 12mo. 4s. bds.

#### EDUCATION.

Carpenter's Orthographical Assistant. 3d Edit. 12mo. 2s. sheep.

Darby's Student's Algebra. 12mo. 3s. 6d. sheep.

Barker's National Reader. 12mo. 4s. 6d. sheep.

Hoogoven's Greek Particles, abridged by Seager. 8vo. 9s. 6d. bds.

Gwilt's Anglo-Saxon Grammar. 8vo. 6s. bds.

Sophocles' *Ædipus Coloneus*, with Notes by Brasse. Royal 12mo. 5s. bds.

Longinus, with English Notes. 12mo. 5s. bds.

#### GEOMETRY.

Wright's Self-Examinations in Euclid. 8vo. 6s. 6d. bds.

#### HISTORY.

Meredith's King of Sweden. 8vo. 12s. bds.

Wyse's Catholic Association. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s. bds.

Historical Recollections of Henry Monmouth. 12mo. 5s. bds.

Principal Events in the History of Ireland. 18mo. 3s. 6d. half-bound.

Taylor's Historical Miscellany. 18mo. 4s. 6s. sheep.

Outlines of Irish History, with Six Engravings. 12mo. 5s. 6d. half-bound.

Piercy's Retford. Foolscap, 6s.; large paper, 8s. bds.

Smith's Farnham. 18mo. 4s. 6d.; fine paper, 5s. 6d. bds.

Cole's Sketches of Scalby, Newby, Burniston, and Cloughton, in the County of York. 8vo. 3s. bds.

#### LAW.

Statutes at Large. 4to. Vol. XI. Part III. with Index. 1l. 2s. bds.

Page on the Poor Laws. 2d Edition. 8vo. 5s. bds.

Chitty's Stamp Act, 1829. 12mo. 9s. bds.

Williams's Abstract, 10, Geo. IV. 8vo. 7s. bds.

Roscoe on Bills of Exchange, &c. 12mo. 15s. bds.

Platt on Covenants. Royal 8vo. 1l. 5s. bds.

Petersdorf's Law Reports. Vol. XI. Royal 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d. bds.

Stewart's Practice of Conveyancing. Vol. II. Royal 8vo. 1l. 1s. 6d. bds.

Wicksted's Bills of Costs. 8vo. 6s. bds.

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. Vol. XXI. Royal 8vo. 1l. 1s. bds.

#### MEDICINE, SURGERY, AND ANATOMY.

Christison on Poisons. 8vo. 16s. bds.

Stanley's Lithotomy. Royal 4to. 15s. bds.

Atlas to Bateman on Cutaneous Diseases. By Dr Thomson. Royal 8vo. 3l. 3s. bds.

Bell's Anatomy and Physiology. 7th Edition. 3 vols. 8vo. 2l. 12s. 6d. bds.

Edinburgh Medical Transactions. Vol. III. Part II. 8vo. 12s. bds.

Cooper's (Bransby) Lectures. Vol. I. 8vo. 15s. bds.

- Palmer's Illustrations of Medicine. 8vo. 10s. bds.  
 Bow on Fever. 8vo. 3s. 6d. bds.  
 Bates on Acute Inflammation. 8vo. 8s. bds.  
 Cooper's (Sir A.) Lectures. Royal 18mo. 8s. bds.  
 Grainger's Elements of Anatomy. 8vo. 14s. bds.  
 Waller's Midwifery. 18mo. 3s. 6d. bds.  
 Stevenson on Coughs and Colds. Royal 18mo. 3s. bds.  
 ——— on Nervous Affections. Royal 18mo. 3s. 6d. bds.  
 Elliott's Medical Pocket-Pook. Foolscap. 5s. bds.  
 Teale on Neuralgic Diseases. 8vo. 5s. bds.  
 Health without Physic, or Cordials for Youth, Manhood, &c. 12mo. 6s. bds.  
 Economy of the Hands, Feet, Fingers, &c. 12mo. 4s. bds.  
 Ward on Burns and Scalds. 8vo. 2s. sewed.  
 Titley on Lues Venerea. 8vo. 16s. bds.
- MISCELLANEOUS.
- Literary Souvenir, 1830. 12s. Large paper, 1*l.* 4s.  
 New-Year's Gift, 1830. 8s. bds.  
 Roby's Traditions of Lancashire. 2 vols. Royal 8vo. India proofs, 4*l.* 4s.; proofs and etchings, 4*l.* 14s. 6d. bds.  
 Crutterell's Housekeeper, 1830. 2s. sewed.  
 Annual Register, 1828. 8vo. 16s. bds.  
 Ellen Cameron. 12mo. 5s. half-bound.  
 Encyclopædia Metropolitana. 2d Division, Mixed Sciences. Vol. I. 4to. 3*l.* 3s. bds.  
 Book of the Boudoir. By Lady Morgan. 2 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 1s. bds.  
 Davenels (The.) 2 vols. post 8vo. 18s. bds.  
 Napier's War. Vol. II. 8vo. 1*l.* bds.  
 Bedford on the Catholic Question. 8vo. 10s. bds.  
 Bee (The) Preserver. 12mo. 3s. bds.  
 Best's Personal and Literary Memorials. 8vo. 14s. bds.  
 Barker's Parriana. Vol. II. 8vo. 18s. bds.  
 Morrison's Mercantile Teacher's Assistant. 12mo. 5s. sheep.  
 Foreign Quarterly Review. Vol. I. to IV. 8vo. 3*l.* bds.  
 Ten Introductory Lectures at the London University. 8vo. 12s. bds.  
 Picture of Australia. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d. bds.  
 Wilmot Warwick. Vol. II. Crown 8vo. 9s. bds.  
 Garden (The) of Surrey, or Sketches of Dorking. 12mo. 4s. bds.  
 Williams's United Family. 18mo. 2s. 6d. half-bound.  
 Friendship's Offering, 1830. 12s.  
 Iris (The) 1830. 12s.; large paper, 1*l.* 4s.  
 Knight's Heraldic Illustrations. 4to. 1*l.* 1s. bds.  
 ——— Specimens of Crests. 4to. 1*l.* 10s. bds.  
 Keepsake, 1830. Post 8vo, 1*l.* 1s.; royal 8vo, 2*l.* 12s. 6d. bds.  
 Juvenile Forget-Me-Not, 1830. 18mo. 8s. half-bound.  
 Gem (The), 1830. 12s.; proofs, 1*l.* 1s.  
 Winter's Wreath, 1830. 12s. bds.  
 Stories of Waterloo. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1*l.* 8s. 6d. bds.  
 Golden (The) Lyre, 1830. 10s. 6d. silk.  
 Marriage, by O'Donnoghue. 12mo. 4s. bds.

Amulet (The) 1830. 12s.

Colonel De Lacy Evans on the Probability of an Invasion of British India. 8vo. 8s. bds.

Life on Board a Man-of-War. 12mo. 4s. bds.

Atlantic Souvenir, 1830. 12s.

Appendix to McFarlane's Constantinople. 4to. 6s. sewed.

Wilson's Stranger's Guide through London. English, with a map, 2s. 6d.; French, 2s. 6d. sewed.

Familiar Elucidations on Composition. 18mo. 3s. bds.

Fincham's Shipbuilding. 8vo, and plates, folio. 2l. 2s. bds.

Fincham on Mastng Ships and Mastmaking. Royal 8vo. 15s. bds.

Gribble on Fencing Horsemanship. 8vo. 7s. bds.

Landscape Annual, 1830. Post 8vo, 1l. 1s.; royal 8vo, 2l. 12s. 6d.

Henry and Antonio, from the German. 12mo. 6s. 6d. bds.

Protestant Errors, a Tale. By the Rev. N. S. Ellison. 12mo. 6s. 6d. bds.

Clarke's Complete Cellarman. 12mo. 7s. bds.

Life of a Midshipman. Post 8vo. 9s. 6d. bds.

#### NATURAL HISTORY.

Le Keux's Illustrations of Natural History. Nos. I. to VI. 8vo. 1s. each.

Lawrence's Horse, in all his Varieties and Uses. 12mo. 8s. bds.

#### NATURAL PHILOSOPHY.

Library of Useful Knowledge. Natural Philosophy. Vol. I. 8vo. 8s. bds.

Higgins on Light and Optical Instruments. 8vo. 7s. bds.

#### NOVELS AND ROMANCES.

Hoffand's Beatrice. 3 vols. 12mo. 1l. 1s. bds.

Parrot's Son and Ward. 12mo. 4s. 6d. bds.

Borderers (The.) By the author of the Spy. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d. bds.

Tales of My Time. By the author of Blue-Stocking Hall. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1l. 8s. 6d. bds.

Romance of History. Second Series. (Spain.) 3 vols. post 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d. bds.

Stories of a Bride. By the author of The Mummy. 3 vols. post 8vo. 1l. 8s. 6d. bds.

#### POETRY.

The Venetian Bracelet. By L. E. L. Foolscap. 10s. 6d. bds.

Lalla Rookh. An Oriental Romance. By T. Moore. Fifteenth edition. Foolscap. 14s. bds.

Chambers's Scottish Songs. 2 vols. royal 18mo, 12s.; post 8vo, 18s. bds.

————— Ballads. Royal 18mo, 6s.; post 8vo, 9s. bds.

Best's Cuma, and other Poems. Post 8vo. 14s. bds.

Nurse's Evening, and other Poems. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d. bds.

Gideon, and other Poems. By the author of My Early Years. 12mo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

Clarke's Lays of Leisure. 8vo. 12s. bds.

Hood's Epping Hunt, with Cruickshank's Designs. 18mo. 2s. sewed. Proofs, 2s. sewed.

Rhymes on Matrimony. Post 8vo. 3s. bds.

## THEOLOGY.

Wardlaw's Miscellaneous Sermons. 8vo. 12s. bds.

Lecker's Lectures on the Catechism, in Question and Answer. 12mo.  
4s. 6d. sheep.

Stevens's Comments. Vol. XV. 8vo. 10s. bds.

Burton's Bampton Lectures. 8vo. 15s. bds.

Graves on Predestination and Necessity. 8vo. 7s. bds.

Crombie's Natural Theology. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s. bds.

Dialogues on Prophecy. Vol. III. 8vo. 12s. bds.

Identity of the Druidical and Hebrew Religions. 12mo. 5s. bds.

Paget's Way of Peace. 12mo, half-bound.

Christian Manual, selected from Law's Works. 12mo. 3s. 6d. bds.

Pulpit. Vol. XI. and XII. 8vo. Each 8s. bds.

## VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

Humboldt's Travels. Vol. VII. 8vo. 14s. bds.

Murray's North America. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 1s. bds.

Morton's Journey in Italy. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s. bds.

Mignan's Travels in Chaldea. 8vo. 14s. bds.

Rosc's Four Years in South Africa. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d. bds.



052 EDI

Vol. 50 (Pt. 142)

Library

7771

Date 30.7.75.

THE

## EDINBURGH REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1830.

No. C.

ART. I.—1. *Lectures on the Philosophy of Modern History, delivered in the University of Dublin.* By GEORGE MILLER, D.D., M.R.I.A. 8 vols. 8vo. Dublin, 1816-28.

2. *Mahomedanism Unveiled: an Inquiry, in which that Arch-Heresy, its Diffusion and Continuance, are Examined on a New Principle, tending to confirm the Evidences, and aid the Propagation, of the Christian Faith.* By the Rev. CHARLES FORSTER, B.D. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1829.

THERE is a considerable portion of our species who have been long and creditably distinguished by the title of 'good sort of people.' There is also a corresponding branch of literature composed for the most part under their auspices, and known by the name of 'good books.' Now, both of these classes are proverbially secure against criticism. They are sacred not only by the purity of their intentions, but by the important office that they respectively perform. As concerns good sort of people, let any country town only consider the state to which it would be reduced, were it discovered some fine morning that this rather unappreciated part of its population had suddenly disappeared. As concerns their books, with some little variety in the substance, and with considerable distinction of letter-press and type, they furnish an appropriate, plain, and healthy food of easy intellectual digestion for the numerous members in whose service they are so assiduously prepared. The craving void of an unoccupied existence is respectably filled up. The poor reader is preserved from the ale-house, and the more wealthy student, male or female, kept awake till an hour of reasonable bedtime. A habit of something approaching to reflection is thus, in some measure, cultivated; and useful subjects are kept before the mind, on which



this habit, as it is forming, may exercise its unpractised powers. These books represent the Ballast of Literature. Though the ballast is not exactly that portion of a ship and of its equipments which most excites the impatient curiosity of a visitor, it is nevertheless a department just as necessary to the prosperity of the voyage, as the directing rudder or the towering mainsail.

Under cover of the Letters of Safe Conduct, so deservedly granted to writings of this description, a very different kind of book and person—of much greater pretension, but of much more doubtful character—has often been expected, and usually allowed to pass. Several people (in some cases individual students, in others almost a School) seem to have persuaded themselves that they have discovered a private key to God's government of the world. If excellence of intention were sufficient title to the above privilege of inviolable impunity, their claim may perhaps equally be made out. At least, we would not dispute it, notwithstanding some apparent pride of 'high imaginations,' belonging naturally enough to more aspiring talents, and more abundant learning—notwithstanding, also, the reckless confidence with which their theories dispose of the wholesale happiness of mankind, whether the question be of happiness temporal or eternal. But good intention is not all that is required in an instructor, especially when he undertakes to strike out new lights in most obscure, yet most important, investigations. Religious subjects, or secular subjects religiously discussed, cannot be safely left to the elaborate travesty of a learned masquerade, however perfect the good faith with which it may be put on. Were the spare talent accumulated in this country at present so excessive, that we could afford to risk a portion of it on hopeless speculations—the bubbles and South-Sea schemes of literary or religious zeal—still any striking waste of pains and ingenuity, is always matter of charitable regret, for the sake of the immediate parties implicated in an unprofitable adventure. But ingenuity in such cases is generally worse than wasted. The authors, it is true, themselves seem, on this occasion, to have little idea of the difficulty, and none of the danger, of their task. Many who might dress the Ark of Israel with gracious garlands, and serve to dance before it, may yet be very unfit champions to lead it into gratuitous battles of their own provoking, or to defend it by the prowess of their single arm. Good men are really very ill advised, who, in the present age, will keep straggling from the camp on guerilla expeditions, into mountain-passes where the enemy will assuredly cut them off. The first thing in reconnoitering the ground on which a good reasoner proposes to offer battle, is to ascertain its weak points, and at once abandon them. There is no end of substantial causes that have been sacrificed

through the opposite injudiciousness of partisans, both in attempting to include within their limits a wider space than their forces could defend, and by taking up positions which they could never rightly have been called upon to defend at all. Meantime, unsound arguments excite suspicion as much almost as unfair ones. What Paley says of pious frauds and the detection of them, is true, in the next degree, of pious fallacies :—‘ Christianity has suffered ‘ more injury from this cause, than from all other causes put ‘ together.’ We have almost always found it to be the case with persons whom we have talked with, that they have been much less embarrassed by the logic of its enemies, than by the illogicalness and unreasonableness of its friends.

Our thoughts have lately been driven forcibly into this channel. A few words will explain the circumstances under which we happened to select the particular case that is the subject of the present article, as an exemplification of our general remarks. Like every one else, we have been endeavouring to connect together the various causes that have conspired to bring about the actual condition of the Turkish government, and of the people who are unfortunate enough to live under it. Whilst we were proceeding to examine the probable future of the countries themselves, and the political consequences that might be gathering over other nations from this quarter, we observed that sundry of our countrymen had fallen upon a much shorter method. From whatever point a diplomatist may wish to contemplate the destinies of the Ottoman empire, the sons of the Prophets will have anticipated him. They are gone up the mountain to look into the east, and call down the cloud, which, however, in the present instance, was there before them, already bigger than their hand. Enthusiasts, who six centuries ago would have been seen taking up the cross against the Saracens, and following the lion-hearted Richard to the Holy-Land, have contented themselves to-day with the more prudent course of an apocalyptic divination, and mere polemical crusade. If it were the nature of fanaticism to take lessons from experience, the passion of abusing a solemn evidence of the Christian faith, into the prurient gratification of a disputatious and fanciful curiosity, would have been long ago shamed to silence. One of the most characteristic features of our religion—its Prophecies—has been debased and distorted, till it has become almost a mask and a reproach. The trumpet which Angels would tremble to take up, is made a bauble and a newsman’s horn in every hand. The Apostles were not cold in their graves before an intemperate misapplication of the prophetical language of our Saviour discredited, scandalized, and disturbed their infant church. Scarce a century has passed, from that time to the

present, but what has been disgraced by some similar appeal to the fears and credulity of mankind. The circle of error in each case has enclosed a greater or less space, in proportion as the public mind was liable to be acted on at the time by the panic of such alarms. The shock has varied, too, according as whether it was some Polypheme who threw a rock into the waters, or only an unlucky stripling amusing himself in making what are called 'ducks and drakes' of texts of Scripture on the surface. Sir Isaac Newton paid the penalty to human weakness on the subject of prophetical interpretations, to a degree that seems almost allied with the unfortunate eclipse of mind under which he suffered for a period. Yet nobody has more deprecated the unwarrantable presumption of the new sort of witchcraft which thus tampers with the dark sayings of God's word, and the secrets of futurity, 'as if God designed to make them prophets.' The ludicrous ill fortune that, wherever a mistake was possible, has attended these anticipations, is in itself their condemnation. Grave scholars, telling in this way the fortune of a kingdom, have made as little out of their materials as astrologers of the conjunction of the planets, or gipsies from the lines of the Sultan's hand. Charles the First is said to have consulted Lilly. He certainly did not get much by it. Our greatest speculators in prophecies were among our latest dabblers in astrology. If Mr Irving and Mr Varley were to be taken into the pay of government at present, and a Prophecy Department established at the Foreign Office, the success of the experiment would not long preserve them against the sceptical economy of Mr Hume. However, if there is any foundation for a tenth-part of the positiveness of their predictions, the experiment ought certainly to be made, both that the stars may not be found fighting against Sisera, nor Sisera fighting against the stars. An astrologer was formerly as necessary to a Court, as a piper to a Highland chieftain. The University of Oxford seems to have employed its soothsayer up to enlightened days. Walton, treating of the Wottons, as of a family that seemed to be beloved of God, 'who did speak 'to many of them in dreams,' mentions, among sundry instances, 'one short particular of Thomas Wotton, whose dreams did 'usually prove true, both in foretelling things to come, and in 'discovering things past.' His son, the celebrated Sir Henry Wotton, being at Oxford, 'when the University treasury was 'robbed by some townsmen and poor scholars, his father wrote 'him a letter out of Kent, dated three days before it happened, 'which threw such a light into this work of darkness, that the 'five guilty persons were presently discovered and apprehended, 'without putting the University to so much trouble as the casting of a figure.'

Those successive ‘cobwebs to catch flies,’ which are annually suspended by our zealots on every road side, have been, for the chief part, most unmercifully smashed by the uncourteous contradiction of directly opposite events. The weavers of them, however, are above being deterred by the fatality which has thus reduced their per centage of plausible prognostications below the luck of Moore’s Almanac in any ordinary year. They are, we are well aware, of too sublimated a race, and soar into too elevated regions, to be recalled by any lure of mere human argument from their cloudy flight. The only sign which they indisputably have verified of the latter times being come upon us—the multitude of false prophets—is the only one which they do not allude to: it is one certainly of which they have no great reason to be proud. In the meantime, it occurred to us, that although we could by no means consent to let go our hold of secondary causes, and ask these enthusiasts to calculate the phases of the waning Crescent; yet it might be worth while to turn back on a soberer mission, under the guidance of some of the more discreet and distant relations of their house. The object of our modified enquiry was, the nature and success of their Providential Commentary upon the earlier history of the Ottoman power and the Mahomedan religion. Two Irish writers have recently rushed into this field, with a fervour characteristic of their nation, and with a literary commissariat, well provided for pushing as far forward in their mysterious enterprise as its nature will admit. If the result should not correspond with their expectation, the principal regret with themselves, as well as with their reader, must be, that they have not chosen a less intractable, as well as safer subject—one where an approximation to success should have been a more probable contingency, and where a failure could not be attended with injurious consequences to the cause.

It is but a small part of Dr Miller’s undertaking, with the detail of which we are brought in contact for our present purpose:—only a single chapter out of a work extending over eight volumes. The specimen that we take, however, is more than a fragment; it is that of a whole apartment, warmed by the same flues, and fitted up on the same system, as the remainder of the building. Besides, our brief examination of the mode in which this particular chapter, on the Ottoman Empire, is executed, must be prefaced by some general remarks upon the soundness of the principle, as a practical one, on which the whole work is founded. That work is entitled, *Lectures on the Philosophy of Modern History*, and is printed at the press of the Dublin University, under whose patronage the lectures were delivered. Dr Miller is at present master of the royal school of

Armagh; and distinguished, we understand, even among the Irish clergy, for his bitter hostility against the late great saving measure of religious peace to his unhappy country. *The Mahomedanism unveiled* of Mr Forster, is even a more singular performance. The author is chaplain to Dr Jebb, Bishop of Limerick. The dedication to the Bishop expressly mentions, that 'through every previous stage of the work, it has been the 'author's happiness to find in his lordship a safe and wise adviser;' and, that in passing it through the press, 'each sheet 'has had the censure of a vigilant but friendly eye.' It would appear, therefore, that the theory here presented, whose novelty and rashness might have startled a Warburton, has received the approbation of this eminent prelate, in whom our readers will recognise the chief parliamentary champion of the Irish church. There are minds, for which the difficulties of a brilliant paradox appear to have a charm that is perfectly irresistible.

A Providential History of past events may be written in two ways; either with the general object of justifying the ways of God to man, by keeping constantly in view the end that Providence may be supposed to have contemplated in our eventful story; or by striving, through the particular application of a bold comparative criticism, to delineate the precise course of human affairs which God has directed into the channels that He had by ancient prophecy marked out. Every man who believes in the moral government of the world, probably presumes, before he has yet looked with this view into history, that he may at once refer to its testimony, for the grounds and warrant of his belief. He will afterwards, we apprehend, discover that the principle of this belief is derived, in most cases, from reasonings of a different description; and that the express evidence which is contained there, upon this point, falls short of his first natural expectations. The fact may, nevertheless, be not a jot the less true, although a satisfactory exposition of it cannot be set out page by page in a chronological history of the different families of our race. The possibility of such an exposition must depend, in the first place, upon the clearness with which a specific end, and the means pursued for its accomplishment, (of a kind to expressly manifest a divine superintendence,) are impressed on human actions; in the next, on the degree in which our faculties are competent to the task of following up these traces. Every Christian, in like manner, must wish to make good an irrefragable appeal in behalf of Revelation, by a simple juxtaposition of the several prophecies in the Scriptures, alongside the particular events by which they are understood to have been fulfilled. The probability of success in any general, or particular application of this experiment, must again depend upon the distinct-

ness which the supreme Being has imparted to the language, thus consecrated as prophetical; and also (presuming that the passages really relate to an accomplished prophecy) upon the knowledge, sagacity, and caution which we employ in connecting the prediction and the promised facts. The two methods above mentioned, naturally run into each other. Dr Miller has taken the first; Mr Forster, principally the second. Without prejudging any particular system, it may be observed, there are a few broad cases, both of Providence and Prophecy, on which mankind seems pretty well agreed. A struggle to extend them by ingenious refinements, and minute researches, can scarcely end in any other manner than that of selecting out of a hundred equally probable hypotheses, some favourite fancy,—committing all sorts of violence on common sense and history in its behalf, and then setting it up as a windmill, stumbling-block, or snare, to the hinderance of all well-disposed persons who are peaceably journeying on the beaten road. For protection, we refer our readers to the two very able sections on ‘Enthusiasm of Prophetical Interpretation,’ and on ‘Enthusiastic Abuses of the Doctrine of a particular Providence,’ in a recent publication on the *Natural History of Enthusiasm*.

Dr Miller assumes, as the basis of his system, that all the events of this world have an intrinsic connexion, ‘which gives them the coherence and the unity of a moral drama.’ A single event or period taken by itself, is as a grain of dust in this mighty balance. The history of any particular kingdom must necessarily be a poor unphilosophical performance; for, your philosopher is represented as having only one alternative—that of generalization, like Montesquieu, or of combination, like Dr Miller. Even the domestic utility of a government to the individuals living under it is unimportant, in comparison with its relative utility as regards the general system. Human history being thus a drama of the Divine Providence, all its parts are, with a strict unity of action, supposed to be made subordinate and conducive to the result. The duty of the philosophical historian is, under these circumstances, represented as being very clear. In the first place, it is assumed, that the progressive revolutions of society must bear a strict proportion to the perfection of the superintending wisdom by which they are controlled. In the second, that it is desirable that this coincidence should be made out as clearly in the moral, as in the material world. On the above dramatic supposition, it follows, that this duty will be best discharged, by considering, not so much transactions themselves, as their combinations; and by tracing in the events of human history those mutual relations which constitute them parts of one great system of moral order.

This is a magnificent outline. Whoever could convincingly fill it up would undoubtedly take his place at once, and foremost, among the benefactors of mankind. That it is a thing 'un-attempted yet in prose or rhyme,' seems no presumption against it in the eyes of its author. The method announced is evidently more the theology than the philosophy of history. It would be only so much the better, if successfully executed. It promises not merely a picture of the progress of society, and a demonstration of the causes from which successive improvements have been derived, but it undertakes to substantiate, as on a chess-board, the principle on which the moves are made towards the development of a grand and consistent plan. The existence of evil compels Dr Miller to substitute the moderate title of 'Agathist' for that of 'Optimist.' Pawns, therefore, must fall, and bishops ; but he will in part indemnify us, by pointing out the reason. A volume of history so written is pledged, by its preface, to make a suitable companion to Paley's admirable book on *Natural Theology*, and might be called *Historical Theology* accordingly. It is either that or nothing. If it is not a Herschell's telescope, to bring new stars from heaven within our ken, it is a mere kaleidoscope of painted glass from some broken college window.

In case the author fails in satisfying our understanding, he may rouse our fancy by dim glimpses of the chariots of God on other mountains than those around Samaria, and the angel of the Lord standing in the way of other embassies as well as Balaam's. The imagination must be excited by the strange neighbourhood which such a system must establish betwixt events that were never before presented to our unpurged vision under any possible connexion. Many hearts, too, will be touched to sympathize in the secret anxiety and delight with which devout minds are thus exhibited, looking out every where around them for the presence of the Supreme Being. So far, it is no objection that ordinary tempers are incapable of entering into these individual impressions. Every one must pick out for himself 'the bright spots' that happen to be personally most convincing, from among the bewildering prospects of universal nature. A Paley contemplating 'the pleasures of a healthy infant,' as a clearer proof of the benevolence of the Deity than any other thing, and a Baxter confirming his wavering mind by a quaint recital of the special providences vouchsafed to him, are pictures which must always soothe, and often improve our feelings. Administered upon this principle, an occasional, but gentle dose of historical mysticism, however trivial as a proof, may not be without its charm. On the other hand, private fancies and associations are bound to keep some measures with the public. The serious disadvantages that may attend any

striking failure in the person even of a self-constituted champion, must be set against the above mitigating considerations. God's world and dispensations are not to be guessed at as a riddle to amuse children with, but solved as a problem for the instruction of grown men. In the opinion of perhaps the majority of readers, 'the attempt and not the deed confounds us.' It was the cycles and epicycles of a false science which extorted from the King of Castile the declaration, that he could have made a better world himself. Whilst the main danger consists in thus publishing as proofs, what turn out to be assumptions only,—and those as dreamy and capricious as the tales of the old Cosmogonists, there is some risk that the necessity of similar enquiries should be overrated, as a general proposition. Eager novices, roused, but not satisfied, by the example, may set about ransacking the records of history for themselves, and quote these unlucky pilgrimages in search of the hidden ways of providence, as admissions that the pilgrimage is one which every serious person is called upon to make. Should they lose themselves in the desert, it is not unlikely that they will turn back in despair, and end in denying the existence of what they cannot directly prove by the means which they have been misled to demand as its necessary proof.

The too probable results of inadequate speculations ought to make an author pause before he publishes to the mixed passion and indiscretion of the world, thoughts which might nevertheless cheer and strengthen his solitary hours. We do not recommend an entire abstinence from these topics so much as a cautious awe in handling them. A perfect theory of this perplexing chapter of the origin of evil, however welcome a gift, is no indispensable possession. Religious faith, and feelings derived from, or dependant upon, evidence of any sort, much more on evidence of a particular description, can extend over only an infinitesimally small proportion of those whom a trust in God comforts, elevates, and, it is to be hoped, will save. Had proof of this kind been absolutely necessary, it cannot be imagined that God would have left his world so long without an express revelation of himself; much less that he would have delayed to so late a day, and even now confined to comparatively a small circle, the means of establishing the grounds of a rational and conclusive Natural Theology. It may be admitted also, since the grounds of this latter faith are laid so firm at present, that the importance of making good a positive system of moral and historical theology is become less urgent. The body with its exquisite anatomy, the soul with its mysterious properties and fortune, are of one and the same workmanship, framed and connected by the same hand. Man does not consist 'of two enemies who cannot



‘part, and two friends who cannot agree.’ He is not made up of ‘a god and a beast tied together.’ He is a whole, in the different parts of whose entire construction similar difficulties exist. He is, as it were, one book, of which, if the grammar, and the vulgarest portions astonish us by their perfection, it is no wonder that the higher and sublimer chapters are more than we can comprehend. There can be few, indeed, among those that have duly considered the simplest evidences of natural religion, but who will consent to wait and give God credit, that, having been thus careful over the inferior and material portion of his charge, he has not remained indifferent to our civil and moral destinies;—that is, to by far the nobler half. The period that elapsed before natural philosophy was successfully cultivated, and the apparent improbability, at one time, of ultimate success in it, may seem an encouragement not to despair too soon. Pascal informs us, that the sceptics who had counted the countless stars, and had found them to be just 27,000, were taught by the telescope to retract their presumptuous sneer. At the same time, we are not sanguine. There is nothing like a telescope in the instruments here boldly pointed towards the clouds. Many persons entertain invincible scruples against making such admissions as seem indispensable preliminaries to a satisfactory explanation of the phenomena. In the next place, were no such admissions necessary, the assumed analogy between the material and moral world is far too imperfect to authorise the course pursued on the present occasion.

Historians appear somewhat superstitious. Even Mr Niebuhr (whose translators prudently drop the adverb) sees *clearly*, in the discoveries made by Angelo Maio in the Vatican, that this is the age which was set apart for a good history of Rome. Dr Miller’s is a stronger case. ‘*Favoured by an extraordinary crisis, which so loudly proclaims in its stupendous revolutions that a period of the divine government is now accomplished, I am encouraged to entertain a hope that I may be enabled to discover the connexion of its principal parts.*’ The great system of moral order, promised in what may be called the advertising part of this analysis, as its glorious result, is explained in a further paragraph to mean nothing more than the existence of the two following mitigated facts. First, ‘the prevalence of ‘good;’ secondly, ‘a general progress of improvement.’ Now, the proclaimed discovery consists of the Design, and of the Means. A reader, therefore, looking to the professed object of the work, (nothing less than a commentary on the designs of the divine government), must ask himself what these two facts are proposed to establish. Design merely?—That the design is benevolent? or that the design is perfect? and if not perfect, why not? It is evi-

dent that an estimate of the reasonableness of our author's conjectures, in any given case, with reference even to his own theory, (but much more so generally,) must depend upon our knowing which of these suppositions he adopts. Whatever is the answer, a further enquiry is immediately suggested—namely, whether it is equally true with human events as with the phenomena of nature, that the same observations, which show them to be produced by design, will usually determine, in each particular case, what that design was. If from the nature of the subject, and from our own experience, it is clear that the precise contrary is almost universally the fact, it remains to be ascertained whether the specific measures, (call them hypothesis or experiment,) to which Dr Miller has recourse, for realizing the latter purpose, have been rewarded by a satisfactory result. Not content with a common tendency to the same catastrophe, or with a chain of secondary causes linked together by general rules invisible to mortal eyes, he undertakes to verify the systematic connexion, and identify the particular design. Our specific criticisms respecting the mode in which the examples of dramatic combination are thus wrenched from their proper places, and brought to bear upon an imaginary purpose, designated as the true plot of the divine drama, are of little consequence. They merely show the concentrating force of those prejudices by which materials can be dragged together, and bound up in the construction of a system. The general observations which we propose making, in the first instance, upon the previous points, so singularly unnoticed, or taken for granted in all writings of this class, appear of more importance. It may be consoling perhaps to an author to ascertain that his failure is not attributable simply to defective execution. At all events, it is too evident, that writers on a most critical subject, where error is so possible and so perilous, require to be warned of the necessity of forming a clear view, beforehand, of the objects which they may reasonably hope to accomplish. It is no less plain, that the reader, for whom they labour, can only be saved from inextricable embarrassment by being made acquainted fully and honestly, at the beginning,—if possible, with the suppositions that are required of, and the dilemmas that are prepared for him, but certainly,—with the precise meaning in which the terms involved in the propositions are, when ultimately explained, found to be really understood.

So strong is our sense of the humble spirit which constitutes our best protection in such enquiries—of the prejudices which surround them—of the disadvantages to which public discussion concerning them is exposed, that we could be well content to avoid them altogether. But the authors of this School will not

leave us to our state of acquiescence and repose. They refuse us the consolation by which the complaints of Job, and the accusations of his friends, alike were silenced; namely, that the whole is a mystery beyond our comprehension. A general incompetency of this description would be the most complete of all answers to the distinct investigations in which they are engaged. Until we can understand how a benevolent Being should allow the existence of such a man as Bonaparte, or of such a sensation as Cold, it is not very likely that plausible information should be tendered to us, in what manner it was a part of the divine scheme that Bonaparte should lose his army in the snows of Russia. Writers, consequently, who profess to illuminate us on the latter point, cannot wrap themselves and the subject in a cloud, and pretend to be in the dark as to the former. The time also is past, when any thing could be gained by silence, evasion, or forbearance. The challenge to the divine attributes which is proposed by the dilemma betwixt infinite power, and infinite goodness, has been long indecently proclaimed, (it is evident with what intent,) from certain scandalous shop windows, to every passenger through Fleet Street. The dilemma is put in too popular a shape to admit of mystification; and is in itself too simple to receive more than one direct and satisfactory explanation. The fact, that moral impossibilities may exist as invincible as mathematical ones, is no diminution of the divine perfections.

Dr Miller states, that the study of human events, as well as of external nature, tends to illustrate the divine perfection. His general expressions, also, boldly direct his disciples to the stage of history for evidence of that perfection. Words so absolute must at first appear to correspond but ill with the very modified conclusion of prevalent and progressive good, to which, nevertheless, he expressly adds, that the effect of his illustrations and his evidence is reduced. No reasoning, except what is founded upon Revelation, is entitled to build a general theory of the system of the world upon assumptions concerning the character of God. In every other case, we must argue up to the character of God from what we can discover of the system of the world. In either mode, it is of course assumed, that we are capable of understanding the proposition thus presented to our reason, and of appreciating its appropriate proofs. Every body will agree with Dr Miller, that it does not belong to man to determine what is the best world which it is possible for a being of infinite perfection to have created. There are many subjects on which our ignorance is so complete, that man has no means of forming an opinion ~~on~~ their merits. If, nevertheless, the blind will lead the blind, ~~both~~ master and scholar, whilst in the very act of predicating

and propounding, must take their chance of tumbling into the ditch. In other subjects, man, when a certain point of perfection has been attained, is evidently at a stand, and he is bound in wonder and humility to presume the rest. But the fact, that a Being, whose power might yet be far from infinite, may in his works outstrip our wildest imaginations of optimism, is so far from being an explanation of the present condition of the world, that it tells as an argument precisely the other way. Our understandings, it is true, are finite enough to prove the folly of our entering into controversy with a more perfect nature, on questions of possibility or degree. Yet we have a knowledge of good and evil, and have been told the melancholy occasion on which it was acquired. We are warned against calling good evil, and evil good. We are bound also to adore the Supreme Being in His gracious attributes. No contradiction, therefore, can be greater than that of stultifying our intelligence to the point of incapacitating us from discriminating between the ideas whose words we are summoned to pronounce, and by whose obligations our consciences are bound.

When we speak of God's power and goodness, if we mean any thing, we must mean power and goodness in their ordinary acceptance. The goodness of God is the goodness of man raised and purified to an infinite extent. If, in the divine government of the world, any event is represented to us which would be evil in a human being, it is a sophism—and if it were not used by good men with a good view, we should say hypocrisy and blasphemy—to confuse our judgments, by protesting that the human understanding is incompetent to determine whether what would be evil in our fellow-creatures, may not be the perfection of goodness in the Supreme Being. It is by this species of mental intimidation, that in the heathen temples, it could be bitterly demanded of the worshipper, whether he should wish his child to resemble the divinity before whom he bowed. There is only one possible security against worshipping a demon, whilst we fondly dream that we are kneeling to the pattern of all virtue. It is, whenever the existence of evil is recognised as a fact, not to cover it up under fine words, and prostrate ourselves before the undistinguished mass of good and evil, but manfully to set about some plain and intelligible explanation. No abstract argument concerning the nature of the first cause, can overrule the necessity of a solemn test which shall separate right from wrong, keep our own moral principle sound and healthy, restore honourable notions of God himself, and justify his ways to man in the only manner in which they can be really justified to reasonable beings. The Christian Revelation, duly interpreted, neither precludes nor embarrasses such enquiries. The language of the Bible,

where human passions and partialities, our hatreds and our preferences, are attributed to God, is understood and attempered soon after we leave the nursery. Far less violence of construction is required for modifying the epithets, infinite and perfect, as used in Scripture, and on all ordinary occasions. God is infinite and perfect as compared with man. His works are impressed with visible marks of a power, wisdom, and goodness, so far beyond the imitation and comprehension of his creatures, that we may well ascribe to these, his attributes, an infinite perfection. Our highest intelligence is to catch the glimpses of his purpose; humbly to co-operate in his designs is our proudest service; devoutly to adore his immeasurable greatness is our chief happiness and glory. The evidences of this kind which surround us are so numerous, that we are authorised in peremptorily excluding any manifest defect, delay, or circuitry of action from the divine designs.

In our prayers, we daily call our condition an imperfect one, and describe the Supreme Being as perfect—most properly, if the necessary condition is understood. Of the two theories that strive to represent God as perfect before his creatures, which of them is it that approaches nearest to the attainment of its object?—that which believes he might have avoided, or that which believes he was not able to avoid, the 'evil that both acknowledge to be existing in his world? On the last supposition, God has made the world, the best that under the circumstances and upon the whole case it was possible to make it; on the former, it might have been made better than it is, and yet God has held back his hand. Surely the proper answers to this incredible alternative are, first, the protestation, that from relations incomprehensible to us, it may actually be a great deal better than it is often represented by a gloomy and precipitate discontent; but next, and chiefly, that for aught we know it was impossible to make it better. By this is meant not an impossibility of God's own making, or one which he could have avoided. That supposition, of course, is no answer to the question which asks how a Being, without evil himself, could admit evil into the world. Such a statement is only allowing, under a different form of words, the fact which the question itself assumes. The only real answer must be, that it is an impossibility, but not one of God's making, or one which he could have avoided. The idea that remains of the divine power, when the actual imperfections of the material and moral world are recognised as metaphysically necessary, is brought practically (if not verbally) into a grandeur of a much sublimer form. A certainty of God's goodness and a confidence in his wisdom, set the heart at rest. We are no longer in suspense, under the supposed necessity of up-

OS2 EDT  
vol. 50 (Pl. H 2)

holding a conclusion of which we feel that the evidence falls short. The contemplation of God's works becomes a delightful task. When it is once conceded that evil,—whether it be an abstract passive principle in the nature of things, or a personal and mischievous agent, (as Satan is figured in the Scriptures,)—exists not of God, and by his means, but underived from him, and opposed to him, all is clear. The evil is finite within certain bounds. God is infinite beyond them. Whatever other obstacles may darken or impede his path, there will no longer be any insuperable contradiction for the historian of Providence to reconcile, between the events of this world and the divine attributes. The mind, gladdened and enlightened, finds a theme for perpetual gratitude to feed on, in observing the infinite provisions by which, notwithstanding every difficulty, God makes even this world 'a happy one after all.'

The cry of Manicheism will frighten nobody, who does not prefer splendid phrases to consistent ideas; and who really is aware of the only alternative which is left him. Utility is not less the test to which moral principle must be brought, notwithstanding the dangerous subtleties of the school of Escobar. So, an elemental and inherent impossibility of making more out of matter and spirit than has been made of them, is not the less agreed on by the greatest Christian reasoners as the only full solution of the problem in which we are engaged, because Bayle has helped to confirm a prejudice against the doctrine by advocating it more in the spirit of doubt than of consolation and repose. A reader of his article on the Paulicians, will see that this belief, however frequently misapplied, is coeval, in the schools of Zoroaster and Pythagoras, with our earliest evidence of the exercise of the human understanding.

Dr King, in his *Origin of Evil*, describes 'God as being obliged 'to suffer these or greater evils.' Soame Jenyns suggests, (*Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Evil*), that in a universal system of things, such 'numberless inconveniences might possibly arise, that all that Infinite Wisdom could do was to make 'choice of that method which was attended with the least and 'fewest, and this not proceeding from any defect of power in 'the Creator, but from that imperfection which is inherent in 'the nature of all created things.' In a Review of this *Inquiry*, to which the terror of his name gave a celebrity that the logic of it, at least, but ill deserves, Dr Johnson justly passes over the above distinction, as being a distinction without a difference, and reproaches Jenyns for a 'dogmatical limitation of omnipotence.' Now Johnson begins his Review, by assuming that the solution of the problem, 'Whence came evil?' is necessary to the demonstration of the attributes of God. He declares further, that the

degree of evil in the world might have been less, as far as human eyes can judge, without any impediment to good. If we are compelled to decide between these respective dogmatisms, there can be no doubt but that there is contained in Johnson's the source of much greater perplexity to the scrupulous, and of a worse encouragement to impious presumption. His grotesque sketch of the delight that superior beings may receive from human sufferings, may indeed then hang over our heads like some terrible probability.

The three perhaps most celebrated Ecclesiastics of the last century,—Butler who was a bishop, Balguy who might have been one, and Paley who ought to have been one,—acquired their principal renown from being the great masters of this branch of divine philosophy. Out of a deference apparently to popular scruples, and in order to preserve the form of more reverent expression, they cautiously employ words descriptive of an impossibility in the nature of things, rather than words pronouncing the synonymous concession. This impossibility, however, and the adoption of general rules, (under an immediate necessity, or that necessity which is implied in a choice of evils,) as distinguished from an administration of judgments and special providences, lie at the bottom of their general reasoning. Their reasoning would be more forcible were these topics promoted to the top. For let us, *a priori*, definitively deny them these postulates; and their celebrated arguments in behalf of the character of God at once fall through. Paley came last into this field, and, as he raised the main part of his moral philosophy out of the materials of Tucker, he has freely taken out of the abundance of these his two predecessors,—especially in the concluding chapters of his *Natural Theology*. The course in which their writings ought properly to be read at present, would be in part reversed. First, Paley's *Natural Theology*, to prove the fact of design in the course of nature. Next, Butler's *Analogy*, to extend this proof from the natural to the moral world; or rather to confirm the original proof of it, (whatever that may be) by showing that the constitution and course of our nature singularly correspond with the supposition of a moral government. Last, Balguy's *Divine Benevolence Asserted*, to connect more fully in both cases, the proof of divine goodness with the proof of divine wisdom and contrivance. We must refer briefly to the principal passages where these great authorities (as great, two of them at least, as human names well can be in this their own arena,) plainly recognise, in a partial limit to the attribute of divine power, not only an allowable supposition, but the safe and conclusive answer to this great sceptical dilemma.

Paley (*Natural Theology*, ch. v.) having observed that con-

siderable irregularities may take place without bringing into question the existence of an intelligent Creator, proceeds as follows:—‘When faults are pointed out, and when a question is started concerning the skill of the artist, or dexterity with which the work is executed, then indeed, in order to defend these qualities from accusation, we must be able, either to expose some intractableness and imperfection in the materials, or point out some invincible difficulty in the execution, into which imperfection and difficulty the matter of complaint may be resolved; or, if we cannot do this, we must adduce such specimens of consummate art and contrivance proceeding from the same hand, as may convince the enquirer of the existence, in the case before him, of impediments like those which we have mentioned; although, what from the nature of the case is very likely to happen, they be unknown and unperceived by him.’ The latter sentence fits in with his ultimate view of human life, (c. xxvi, p. 365.) ‘If the course of the world was separated from the contrivances of nature, I do not know that it would be necessary to look for any other account of it than what, if it may be called an account, is contained in the answer, that events rise up by chance. But since the contrivances of nature decidedly evince *intention*; and since the course of the world and the contrivances of nature have the same author, we are, by force of this connexion, led to believe, that the appearance, under which events take place, is reconcilable with the supposition of design on the part of the Deity.’ ‘A mind, I say, drawn into the habit of thought which these observations excite, can hardly turn its view to the condition of our own species, without endeavouring to suggest to itself some purpose, some design, for which the state in which we are placed is fitted, and which it is made to serve.’ It is singular that Dr Sumner, in his excellent Treatise on the *Records of the Creation*, should charge Paley with attempting to prove too much. How entirely Paley admitted Dr Sumner’s qualification, that ‘the Deity wishes the happiness of mankind in this world only so far as it may contribute to their final happiness in another,’ is evinced by the declaration, that in his opinion the two Doctrines of Providence and of a Future State, must stand or fall together. He maintains, accordingly, that the supposition of the present life being a state of moral probation is the only hypothesis which rectifies all disorders, and reconciles the degree of chance, apparent in the world, with the fact of a ruling Providence. In connexion with this hypothesis, he proceeds to show, that ‘free agency’ is indispensable to accountableness; is in its essence liable to abuse: and is in point of fact the source of all the mis-



chiefs of which mankind are the occasion to one another. In case, however, we prefer the necessitarian view of human nature, and for moral probation, substitute the phrase 'moral formation,' precisely the same difficulty occurs in both cases. The question returns upon us, whence the necessity of this intermediate process, of a probation or a formation, both equally liable to the same failures? There is only one and the same answer,—that the necessity exists. Paley lays, throughout, an important stress on the distinction between the two classes of real and apparent evils: separating those, supposed to be instances either of imperfection or of chance really identified with the thing itself, from those which are only apparently so, from our ignorance. His language, respecting the exercise of a special providence, is selected upon the same principle. The cases, in which this interference may appear ambiguous, in consequence probably of a reserve of its manifestation being part of the plan of our existence, are kept distinct from the cases to which the interference may not extend. Thus (p. 363) the course of causes which he describes the Deity as possessing the power of winding and turning as he pleases, are not described as being all causes, but 'those which issue from himself.' This limit agrees strictly with the very guarded terms in which he has drawn up his definition of omnipotence; evidently protecting himself by what, in legal phrase, Coke would have called 'an exclusion of a conclusion.' (Chap. xxiv, p. 308.) 'Omnipotence, omniscience, "infinite" power, "infinite" knowledge, are *superlatives*; expressing our conception of these attributes in the strongest and most elevated terms which language supplies. We ascribe power to the Deity under the name of "omnipotence,"—the strict and correct conclusion being, that a power which could create such a world as this is, must be, beyond all comparison, greater than any which we experience in ourselves, than any which we observe in other visible agents; greater also than any which we can want, for our individual protection and preservation, in the Being upon whom we depend. It is a power, likewise, to which we are not authorized, by our observation or knowledge, to assign any limits of space or duration.' 'Whatever be its compass,' (he adds) 'or extent, which it is evidently impossible that we should be able to determine, it must be adequate to the conduct of that order of things under which we live. And this is enough. It is of very inferior consequence, by what terms we express our notion, or rather our admiration, of this attribute. The terms, which the piety and the usage of language have rendered habitual to us, may be as proper as any other. We can trace this attribute much beyond what is necessary for any conclusion to which we have

‘occasion to apply it. The degree of knowledge and power requisite for the formation of created nature cannot, with respect to us, be distinguished from infinite.’ Surely Dr Crombie, in his recent criticism on the opinions upon this subject entertained by Paley, must have overlooked these remarkable passages.

Butler uses the same language. Our pleasures and pains having been placed, for the most part, in our own power, he supposes an objector to demand, why our happiness is thus made dependent on our actions? Of several answers, the first which he puts in, is, ‘Perhaps there may be some impossibilities in the nature of things, which we are unacquainted with.’—(*Analogy*, p. 41.)—‘It is particularly to be observed, that the divine government, which we experience ourselves under, in the present state, taken alone, is allowed not to be the perfection of moral government.’ (P. 56.) ‘It is only’ (he admits) ‘in some degree of present effect,’ that we have a declaration from him who is supreme in nature, which side he is of, or what part he takes; a declaration for virtue and against vice. Certain concurrences are necessary to the prevalence of virtue. There must be sufficient length of time; there must be a fair field of trial,—a stage large and extensive enough; proper occasions and opportunities. A Future State will be that, in effect, to which we now see a tendency. Having thus, in the earlier chapters of the first part of his *Treatise*, represented the course of providence as a struggle against difficulties, and a gradual working up the way to a more perfect state, he afterwards introduces an objector with propositions of direct improvement; either by means of repeated interpositions, or by getting rid of a *scheme* of government, as being only the occasion of irregularities. His answer is derived from the same two sources that Paley was subsequently obliged to have recourse to;—our ignorance, and a probable impossibility. ‘When we know not, but the parts objected against may be relative to other parts unknown to us; and when we are unacquainted with what is, in the nature of the thing, practicable in the case before us; then our ignorance is a satisfactory answer; because some unknown relation, or some unknown impossibility, may render what is objected against, just and good, nay, good in the highest practicable degree.’—‘Apparent irregularities may be also the only means by which wise and good ends are capable of being accomplished.’—‘To prevent all irregularities, or remedy them as they rise, by the wisest and best general laws, may be impossible in the nature of things: as we see it is absolutely impossible in civil governments.’ (P. 151-4.)

The writings of Butler and Paley form (and most deservedly)

the great text-books for religious reasoning throughout the Schools and Colleges of England. Balguy's *Divine Benevolence Asserted*, is also the substance of what were originally college lectures. The work was first published in 1781. The Bishopric of Gloucester was offered him, and declined in the same year. Balguy follows the line of argument which we have already traced. With a just philosophical confidence in his cause, he satisfies himself with pointing out the direct advantages that are obtained by the constitution of animal nature. In respect of the incidental disadvantages objected against the divine benevolence, he treats the supposition that a change could have been made in the bodies of animals, which might give notice of danger to them without the intervention of pain, and which would render them less frail, without destroying their means of preservation, as being answered by the fact, that this is a mere imaginary possibility. Does an objector also demand, why our degree of understanding is not so high as to render us infallible? and our moral sense so great as to preserve us impeccable? we have the same answer renewed in divers forms. 'The objectors will never be able to prove, what they assert with the utmost confidence, that God might have made us more perfect than we are. Most sure it is he can do all things possible. But are we, in any degree, competent judges of the bounds of possibility?' (P. 241.) Again, 'Perhaps perfection cannot be thus obtained (so instantaneously); but men must be gradually formed to that capacity and temper, which are to make them happy for ever.' After suggesting the other and surely more painful alternative, (a limitation of the Divine Benevolence,) he returns to the old theory of Balbus—*ex iis naturis quæ erant, quod effici optimum potuit, effectum est*; and calls on him who can, to refute Leibnitz's assertion, that the best system possible has actually taken place. To the objection, that the happiness of man is dependant on the actions of others, it is replied, 'The faults of men were not intended by their Creator. All instances of misconduct in them are contrary to his will.' (P. 252.) The supposition of another and different system, in which men should be no more than passive instruments, is dismissed as the dream of a possibility which cannot be supported by the slightest proof. The request, that the constitution of the body should have been framed so that pleasure should stop at the point where gratification becomes hurtful, is resisted in the same manner, as being what we have no reason to suppose within the bounds of possibility. Hunger is necessary for the preservation of creatures such as we are; and (as for other kinds of creatures) 'we are surely not judges of the different ways in which it was possible for the Deity to form ~~the~~ preserve animal bodies.' 'Our visionary improvements

‘are assumed upon a liberty of altering many things at a time; of forming a new and fantastic system, perhaps made up of inconsistent parts, and beyond the bounds of possibility itself. So true is that celebrated passage of Cicero, *Si quis corrigere aliquid velit, aut deterius faciet, aut id quod fieri non potuit, desiderabit.*’ P. 271.

Under such a system, the writer who undertakes to promulgate a history of human events, principled and arranged according to God’s designs, undertakes a most extraordinary and awful task. In case he agrees with these distinguished authors, he is bound, in the first place, to draw the line which separates the *possible* from the *impossible*. He is bound, in the next place, to show, in any given course of conduct and of circumstances, the precise degree in which their direction has been affected by the necessary constitution of the physical and moral world. Upon the supposition of the existence of this distinction, a detail of the moral government of the world, written in contempt of it, must be a scene of inextricable mistakes. We ask whether our authors are prepared to furnish the public with a test.

To avoid this dilemma, the existence of any such distinction will probably be denied. In this event, it is not too much to require of the respondents that they will replace, for the use and comfort of rational believers, the system of Butler and of Paley, which this denial pulls down upon our heads. Their confident theories, which presume to explain the movements of this complicated machinery in some of its minutest parts, are totally irreconcilable with the modest and respectful plea that it is inexplicable as a whole. At their hands we are entitled to a clue out of the labyrinth which they know so well. *The defensive only* is not for them. They are bound, therefore, in common charity, to provide us with some shed for refuge from the storm, when they have burned our ancient home. If they sit amid its ruins,

‘And wondering man could want the larger pile,  
Exult, and own their cottage with a smile,’

surely they ought to make their cottage large enough to receive us. We advise them, however, to pause. Their historical difficulties will not be relieved in proportion, so as to make it worth their while to engage in this collateral rencontre. The declaration of an absolute omnipotence magnifies many difficulties of a practical kind, whilst it removes none of any other but those which we have created for ourselves by a gratuitous metaphysical assumption. A history of God’s moral government, according to the former system, is not called upon either in vindication or explanation, to ascertain any design whatever for so much of human events, as may be either not at all or very par-

tially under the divine control. According to the view of an absolute omnipotence, it must answer for all, or show cause by what authority and distinction a portion is selected to descant and dogmatize upon, whilst the remainder is left to battle out its fortune desperately and darkly among the clouds.

It is admitted that reasons can be seen for a good deal often as to the cause, sometimes as to the design. There is abundance of direct evidence in favour of a providence wise and good. Most properly do we reject any argument pretended to destroy, by reason of the imperfection of the human understanding, our competence, and our conviction in our competence, to appreciate this evidence. But we live, it is also true, in a mixed scene of some real and of more apparent evil. If it is sought to put any portion of this evil into an opposite scale, and charge it upon the Supreme Being, a moralist of Butler's school need not shrink from the enquiry. Satisfied with the evidence of the uses of a tooth, he will not insist that the toothach is not an evil. He only challenges the objector to prove that a particle of evil, as such, is existing by design. Impossibilities unknown to us are grounds for believing that, whatever may be the amount of evil, it is the least possible; that, in case it anywhere exists without a beneficial purpose being connected with it, it must be because the cause of it lies beyond the reach of divine influence; that, wherever it is incidental to beneficial purposes, it is submitted to, because the greater benefit could only be procured by the payment of this price. The scheme of nature is so immense, that doubtless also, by unseen and unguessed relations, great good is everywhere in the course of accomplishment, in a way which our ignorance never would have imagined or can foresee. On the other hand, what is the position of an historian of Providence who will not accept these or any other terms of submissive silence—but who resolves to inscribe upon his tablets a notice of the blessings and the judgments of God; and, as he unrolls the map of ancient and modern history, of public and private life before him, apportions them out from the gazette according to his own discretion? Let us suppose, however, that the search for causes may properly be exchanged for that of designs. Let us suppose, also, that we are released from any enquiry concerning the existence of evil, in respect of God's general design. The object of the moral government of the world, in any particular instance of evil, must still depend upon its being ascertained under which of the two characters of real or apparent evil the event in question is to be ranged. A person who engages to write one of these histories, engages to see his way clearly between cases whose outward marks are confessedly the same. Instead of trifling with the honesty and confidence of our

own hearts by flimsy pretexts that cannot satisfy a reasonable mind, however anxious to be satisfied, it is better at once to enquire in all calmness, whether the nature of the case, and of our faculties, holds out a prospect of success in such fanciful speculations.

For this purpose, it is indispensable that the whole case on which we presume to judge, should be before us. Can we believe that this is the fact? The present state of things is, doubtless, the result of what went before it; being at once the fruit of the past, and the germ of the future. Change any previous event, however slight apparently, and there is no saying to what extent subsequent events must have altered also. Books have been made as well as proverbs, on the great consequences of trifling causes. 'For want of a nail the shoe was lost,' &c. says Poor Richard. This Secret History lies generally beyond our observation; not less so the perplexed Chapter of Good brought forth out of Evil; the glorious work in which Milton's Satan acknowledges the counteracting hand of God. Wilful evil, to the degree implied in the distinction, proposed between Agathism and Optimism, (which must, according to every principle of moral reasoning, pass on from the works of God, to God himself,) is inconsistent with our apprehension of his nature. Be the present state of things what it may, all that, in Paley's language, 'issues from God himself,' must be not only what he intended, but what it is worthy of him that it should be. Whether the present state of things, however, is the precise end, with reference to which as an end, the whole precedent combination has been moulded and put in train, is a very different matter. Whatever may be the fact in this respect, it is very plain that, whether at the point upon which man stands, he can possibly have the means of determining this question, is a yet farther and more obscure contingency.

Materials (for any thing we can tell to the contrary) and faculties (as we sensibly feel) are equally wanting us for this task. Call it a problem, we know nothing of its condition. Call it a drama, we know nothing of its plot. Are we not more like a party, who have stumbled into a theatre at half-price, and are disputing among each other whether it is a tragedy, melodrama, or sentimental comedy, that we find performing? Take a perfect plot: the more perfect in itself, the more difficult is it to be conjectured from the bearings of any single scene. Every line in the *Ædipus Tyrannus* leads to the catastrophe. Scarce a Book in the *Odyssey* whose dramatic mechanism does not urge the story forward. Yet the whole requires to be looked back upon, before the effect and adjustment of a single part can be duly understood. Does not every architect complain of the in-

justice of criticising a building before it is half finished? Yet, who can tell what volume of the Creation we are in at present, or what point the structure of our moral fabric has attained? On what sort of pretence or principle of selection can Dr Miller, or the whole University of Dublin, cull out some favourite facts and periods, as finished episodes or particular plans actually completed? What right have they to recast, abridge, and methodize the original publication, as a thing voluminous and obscure; and bind up for the edification of the world their collection of odd volumes, gilt and lettered, with the presumptuous title of the *Beauties and Spirit* of the whole? Whilst we are all in a vessel that is sailing under sealed orders, we shall do well to confide implicitly in our Government and Captain. Nor is it wise, before the orders are communicated to us, to lecture the other passengers upon the objects of the voyage, and either applaud or criticise the particular prudence of the course. Dr Butler's opinion, that 'the particular scheme of the Universe cannot be known without revelation, (for suppositions are not to be looked on as true because not incredible),' is quite as just of the historical scheme and of historical suppositions, as of any other portion of our condition.

The incomprehensibleness of the plan on which the natural government of the world proceeds, and the connexion, by which this natural government is so united with the moral, that they make up together but one scheme, suggest the probability that God's moral administration consists also of a moral plan, related in all its parts, so that every circumstance may look much beyond itself, and be adjusted beforehand with a view to the whole of it. 'Supposing this to be the case,' continues Dr Butler, 'it is most evident that we are not competent judges of this scheme from the small parts of it which come within our view in the present life.' The course of things is accordingly represented by him, as placing us '*in the middle of a scheme*,—not a fixt, but a progressive one, every way incomprehensible; incomprehensible in a manner equally with respect to *what has been*, what now is, and what shall be hereafter.' Dr Miller, adopting the theory of a scheme, is, nevertheless, far from assenting to this state of ignorance. On the contrary, he takes for granted as a fact, necessary to give a plausible colour to his undertaking, that God's moral providence is broken up into parts and periods, and 'from time to time discovers itself in the actual *completion of his plans*.' He goes the length of concluding that, 'at this particular time, it may perhaps be found that much of the difficulty has been removed; and that the tendencies of the past measures of the divine government, *however inexplicable they must formerly have appeared, may now be clearly discerned*.'

In this confidence, he disdains to take Boyle's advice, and stand aside, (as far at least as regards the public revolutions of states,) 'for the great decretory day.'

The distinction by which the divine policy, respecting *individuals*, is adjourned over to that last Tribunal, whilst the case of generations and of nations is deemed clear enough to be gone into at present, seems perfectly unwarranted, either by any difference in the nature of the two cases, or by the facts in evidence, as respectively applicable to each. A kingdom is a collective term only for the individuals that compose it. Its institutions and its circumference are an artificial shell for the beings within it. Compared with the issue at stake upon a single life, its progressive intelligence, happiness, and virtue, the throne of the Cæsars is nothing but a bauble. Whether a Bonaparte or a Bourbon reign in Paris,—whether a Czar issue his *ukase*, or a Sultan his *hatti-sheriff*, from the Seraglio chambers, may, notwithstanding all our speculations, be only marches and counter-marches over our ant-hill, nor fix one positive result, on the great moral destinies of mankind. A comparison of the pages of a universal history with those of a biographical dictionary, will scarcely prove the principles and fortune of a nation to be more powerfully over-ruled by a superintending providence, than the conduct and chances of our individual existence. Instead of looking with one man for judgments, and for perfectibility with another, many persons have come to a conclusion, (which, absurd enough as an analogy, is too much warranted by experience,) that nations are born like individuals to a youth, a manhood, and an old age. Even Paley takes up the notion that our social condition revolves in an apparent cycle, where progressive civilisation brings on corruption; over which a fresh supply of rude barbarian virtue is required to be poured out, like the waters of the Nile, to freshen and invigorate its worn-out soil.

As long as the fate of nations depends on the instrumentality of human actions, it must be involved in all the consequences, which follow from our happiness being so much at the mercy of our own behaviour and of that of others. It must vary with as slight, and often with the very same contingencies, as those that affect the fortune and the life of a single man. As long, also, as the fate of a nation is important, only in reference to that of the human beings who are influenced by its movements, there is no reason to expect from providence a more satisfactory explanation of the life and death of a bad government, than of a bad man. It is agreed that 'an actual completion of the plan,' must be assumed in any particular instance, before we are entitled to conceive that we have the proper materials for forming an opinion upon the particular design. Assuredly, if we must write the special histories of nations or of individuals, there is much



greater appearance of a plan being wound up and finished off, in the probationary or forming process which closes in upon the death of every single individual that has ever lived, than that a plan is terminated in the destruction of half the political empires that have been put up and taken down, like so much temporary scaffolding, in all ages, and in all quarters of the globe.

It is far from being true that any one of the final ends proposed by God must have been already reached. On the contrary, every thing, which has hitherto passed away, and every thing which now surrounds us, may, for aught that we can tell, be itself, the means only—the developement of a gradual system—the impulse towards a catastrophe that is yet to come. This much is manifest, says Butler, that the whole is a scheme in which the operation of various means,—what we often think tedious ones,—takes up a great length of time, before the ends they tend to can be obtained. ‘We know what we ourselves aim at, as final ends : and what courses we take merely as means conducing to those ends. But we are greatly ignorant how far things are considered by the author of nature under the single notion of means and ends ; so as it may be said, this is merely an end, and that merely means in his regard.’ A providential historian, who appeals to the facts that he describes, as to so many measures of the divine administration, must satisfy his readers by what specific test he can distinguish the means from the end, in a system composed of a long series of slow successive steps. To take the single instance of the Ottoman Empire :—can Dr Miller really persuade himself that, in its remote and ambiguous effects upon the civilisation of the West, he has hit upon the true end for which, as a sort of influencing means, this Empire was raised up, and imposed on the prostrate and unregarded misery of the Eastern world ? That the gorse covers, established on a gentleman’s estate, have been sown there for the sake, perhaps, of the poultry yard, but certainly for that of the kitchen garden, forms in our eyes, a much more precise and probable connexion. This is striking at the one neck of Mussulman millions, to save a single hair upon a Christian’s head—sacrificing the existing angel that presides over the happiness of Asia, for the possible fly that may chance to settle on the wheels of the triumphant chariot, in which the genius of Europe is seen moving slowly and safely forward.

A certain philosophical air is sought to be thrown over these and similar speculations, by the analogy that is so properly presumed to exist between the course of providence in its government of the physical and of the moral world. Unfortunately, it is not sufficient, that the latter is the more interesting enquiry, to authorize a writer to calculate the chances of an equally successful investigation. The fact is, indeed, admitted, that the

moral government is 'less capable of certainty.' A reason for this fact also is assigned; 'because the improvable nature of the beings, who are its objects, requires that it should be administered by a progressive plan.' Were this all, nothing can be more probable, than, not only that the comparative certainty in the two pursuits is simply a question of degree, but that, by observing carefully the progress of national and individual improvement, we may catch the intermediate ends which are pursued as successive means in the developement of this scheme. In matters of this kind really within our compass,—as in the nurture and management of a private family, it does not require to be even nurse or schoolmaster, to ascertain (when all the facts are once before us) whether its education is conducted, ill or well, upon any, and upon what design. From the end we can argue to the means—from the means we can argue to the end. There will be a greater variety of objects to be considered under each division; but the evidence of design, however imperfectly the design itself may be completed, is itself as complete in a nursery or schoolroom, as in the shop of a watchmaker or optician. Now, does the world, when examined for this purpose, present us with any thing like this analogy? Dr Miller rises from his survey of it, and with an apparently grave and serious pen, informs us—yes. In the exemplification, however, and furtherance of this design, he contents himself with inventing no other use or occupation for the Turks, than that of being tied up into a sort of rod, to be occasionally applied to the back of Christendom. He seems not to have the slightest notion that any claim for consideration, or for purpose, can be required or suggested on their own account. They are dealt with as though they were mere instruments, like the scymitars in their hands, or the horsetails that wave before their march. Dr Miller's Theory, to the credit of his feelings, does not deal much in judgments. The Turks, therefore, are not represented as existing so much for any penal object, as in order to promote a more rapid circulation, partly of blood, and partly of ideas, throughout the Christian system. Any one who has the patience to transfer this curious picture of the divine discipline over the fairest portion of the world—the Garden of Asia—to our own homes, and think how much less such a scene would resemble the hall of a national school, than a neglected ward in Bedlam, will see the necessity of looking much deeper for the difficulties, that separate the moral from the physical government of God.

The case of children's education, as we have used it for illustration, is one in which the freedom of action is, during the time, suspended, pretty much as in the instance of private soldiers. A regularity of movement is thus obtained, by which you can

reason, from the known designs of the presiding power, to what will be their conduct; and back, from their known conduct, to what must have been the design of their superiors. Remove the pressure, and the mechanical regularity is at an end. Now, the moral government of God is conducted upon the express plan of leaving uncontrolled that mysterious part of our nature, which, whether really free or not, it is acknowledged is felt to be so by ourselves, and appears to be so, practically, to others. If the general rules of necessary cause and effect, or the supposed cases of special interference, could be discovered, this sense of freedom—whether at present a truth or a delusion—must be instantly destroyed. It exists only either because the fact exists, or because the circumstances by which it could be contradicted, are so deep, multiform, and obscure, that they escape every test we can apply, but that of a most unsatisfactory chain of metaphysical abstractions. Our own hearts, thoughts, and conduct, close as they seem to lie to us, are in great part incomprehensible to us, and puzzle ourselves at least as much as they do our neighbours. All appearances in society, and all the events of history, are the necessary result of this apparent freedom of human action. What is thus incomprehensible in its simple, will scarcely become plainer in its compound state. What, therefore, are we likely to make out of public transactions, their causes and results, with reference to the particular designs of God especially, when we are ordered to look at them in their combinations—that is, in forms which everybody may combine in a hundred different ways? A child might be as well asked to put together, according to its true geography, a map of the world, whose unmarked divisions were cut up into equal parallelograms, similar to his box of bricks.

In a certain, and very limited sense, it is true that the materials for moral argument on this subject are before us; but were these materials, in point of fact, arranged as regularly as the mechanism in a watch, the various devices by which we seek to struggle to an opinion concerning their nature and their object, show, that, in this respect we are merely guessing. The moral world affects and awes us; our real opinions on it are, nevertheless, no clearer than those of the Highlander and husbandman about the watch they respectively fell in with, when the one complained 'it died last night,' and the other knocked it on the head in a ditch bottom, as a toad that ticked. It is very different with the material world. The immediate design of that part of it which is within our reach, is clearly defined. It is spread as the canvass for a living picture. It exists for the support of the sentient beings that are connected with it. This great and good end is the direct one. The various means by which this

object is arrived at, are ascertained to move directly to their purpose. The evil also can, thus far, be generally seen to be incidental only.

The design with which the animal frame is constructed for the different uses of animal life—especially the design of the several parts of that human machine, with which our nobler nature is so wonderfully connected—was apparently one of the earliest testimonies that a rude anatomical observation bore to the wisdom of the Supreme Being. One good example, however, goes a great way. A single problem well explained, would entitle Archimedes to credit from his scholar, that the other diagrams in his study were something better than waste paper. Progress was made in some branches of natural philosophy, as in chemistry, by the power of subjecting our materials to repeated experiments; in astronomy, by observations upon the motions and recurrence of the heavenly bodies. Through a patience and sagacity alike admirable, the few simple rules, by which a great portion of the material world is so wonderfully governed, have been brought to light. The design, for the most part, was assumed beforehand. In some instances, as in the case of comets, the course has been reversed; the means are found out, whilst, as to the design, we are not yet behind the scenes. But it is principally as regards the means by which the divine designs are effected, that modern philosophy has explained to us the house in which the family of mankind is dwelling, and the personal frame-work in which our individual being is inwrought. The metaphysician, and the moralist, in their several departments, have done something towards uncoating the inner man, by watching the facts out of which the laws of thought and of moral sentiment must be collected. It is, comparatively, however, vague approximations only; either generalizations so wide, that they are of little help in individual cases—or partial observations, which being probably mixed up with unnoticed circumstances, are unsafe materials for a general rule; or experiments made on the mind in a passive state, which are shivered by the sudden gust of an electric cloud. Observe, educate, protect, form the mind within, and the circumstances without, in the most careful manner, yet, how often are we defeated, and nobody can tell how. If the materials are in a loose way thrown before us, it is evident that the means by which human character is formed to strength or weakness, to vice or virtue, are placed for the most part beyond our criticism and our power. There is a latent principle somewhere in our frame—latent as an element, but of fearful activity as a cause, which breaks to pieces the crucible of the moral alchemist, and defies being

bound by the chain of any general rule that the coarseness of human speculation has yet devised.

The design of the material world we have admitted to be plain enough. We are willing to assume that the end for which inferior natures are introduced upon this earth, may be satisfied by the apparent gratification of their individual existence, or by their ministry to the wants of man, the higher, and master being. The design of an ant-hill and a bee-hive may be circumscribed by the results, and within the limits that we observe to be presented to their stationary natures. The direct object with which man is placed upon this world, is a proposition of much greater obscurity. Notwithstanding his cheerful temperament, Paley allows that the question of human happiness here on earth is much more doubtful than the happiness of that of any other creature. When this design is enquired after, independent of Revelation, it is a question of experience; that is, of human events, interpreted by the best judgments we can form of them. Is the end, that of serving to the happiness of other parts of the creation? Is it that of personal enjoyment? Is it that of personal improvement, either closing here, or extending into a future state? Whatever may be the design, single or combined, the means taken for its accomplishment are, confessedly to human judgments, so circuitous, dilatory, and indirect, that some inexplicable difficulty either in our nature or understanding—that is, either in the thing to be judged, or the thing which judges—has been, in all ages, the only refuge and escape. A great deal appears to be left to causes so intricate, incalculable, and indescribable, that they must on human reasoning pass for chance. In many cases (and this is far worse) the evil seems to be direct and positive; whilst little remains for the opposite scale, but incidental good, and a chance of distant argumentative advantages. Take Paley's watch (or rather Sir Matthew Hale's, for Paley only put it into a new case) and lay it (not alongside the human body and its perspicuous anatomy, but) alongside the moral world. Forgetting for the moment all other proof of an intelligent Creator, look to it, and to the end and means pursued there for all our evidence of design. Take Dr Miller and Mr Forster with you, as privy counsellors or assessors, and see what are the results!

If man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upwards, it must be, (according as this very example was cited by the Platonists) not because the smith goes to his anvil to be an artificer of sparks, but from the accidental effect belonging to the quality of the iron on which he is working, for a greater purpose. What that purpose is, Dr Miller thinks he has found out. Some of his guesses

we think not good ones. The Turks, for instance, can scarcely have been made up into a hammer, in order that a great portion of mankind may be subjected to their blows, and beaten into sparks for the enlightening of Christendom. The universe could make a believer even of Voltaire.

‘ Il est vrai, j’ai raillé Saint Medard et la Bulle ;  
Mais j’ai sur la nature encore quelque scrupule.  
L’Univers m’embarrasse, et je ne puis songer  
Que cet Horloge existe et n’ait point d’Horloger.’

His poem *Sur les Systemes* shows how that particular species of them, called Providential Histories, which will persist in explaining into the absurd, what is in itself only the inexplicable, may unsettle this conviction. They are excellent contrivances for alarming unstable minds into momentary scepticism, from the unlimited extravagance of their suppositions, and their incredible demands upon our faith.

Again, a government of special Providences must be reconciled with one of general rules ; on which, it is admitted, God’s moral government is conducted, however unknown, for the most part, the rules remain. Whilst man is acquainted with so little of the case, it is vain for him to assign himself as Counsel to the Almighty, and make a Brief out of his own conjectures. It is, therefore, incumbent on writers, who take on themselves the office of interpreters, to point out their method of ascertaining (where events, comprehending a crowd of consequences, occur under a general rule) which of the consequences are those that were *particularly* designed. If the events are stated to have taken place, not under a general rule, but under a special Providence and as a premeditated exception, they are equally called upon to show the existence of the distinction generally, and the exercise of it in the particular case. They who love to insist on peculiar privileges and minute specialties, must be conscious that our only security against charlatans and fanatics is in our right to expect further proof than mere assertion. Otherwise, the creed of interpositions must be tried generally by Addison’s rule in the particular case of ghosts—To believe in the theory, but to disbelieve every instance. Suppose any given case, or class of cases, to be taken out of the rank and file of human events, and promoted to the dignity of some special favour or commission, we might safely rest our objection here. Direct miracles, vouched as such, are exceptions, and prove themselves. But in no other instance can any body affect to be in possession of a sign by which these facts may be known from other facts. The inspiration of private judgment is plainly not enough. It becomes,

therefore, mere matter of opinion, in which next-door neighbours have a right to differ, and will certainly act upon the right. That there is a total want of evidence to support it, is not an unreasonable ground for the rejection of a specific claim. But the supposition of a system which distinguishes between a general and a special Providence, requires also to be strictly limited, in theory even. Butler begins by resolving our experience of the ordinary conduct of nature, in regard to intelligent creatures, into general rules of administration; 'in the same way as 'many of the laws of nature respecting inanimate matter may be 'collected from experiments.' He afterwards suggests that God's 'miraculous interpositions' (such, for instance, as in the case of the Christian revelation) may have been 'all along, in like manner, carried on, by general laws of wisdom.' The laws, indeed, remain unknown to us. 'There, however, may be wise and good 'reasons why they should not provide within themselves for every 'exigence as it arises, and also why they should not be broken 'in upon by other miracles.' Upon this supposition, the same suggestion of a probable impossibility, as has been above surmised, in behalf of God's government, under general laws of an ordinary description, will equally apply. It is equally necessary, in any attempt to account for the actual history of mankind, that these general laws, whatever they may be, which regulate miraculous interposition, should be strictly construed. This, or some auxiliary suggestion that is equivalent to it, is evidently required, or the whole question is again at sea.

God's government is a scheme carried on by general laws, under which irregularities arise. Far from imagining that he has launched the world, once for all, into the deep, like a vessel, well-built, provided, and equipped, and then left it to struggle with the waves, the notion of a continuing providence assumes that the general laws which constitute its protection, indeed its existence, are, at every instant of time, maintained only by his vivifying presence. It is understood that human sagacity and observation have discovered some of the general laws which hold together the material world. Any deviation from them would be regarded as an exercise of special providence, and called a miracle. General rules, by which God directs the religious faith, moral dispositions, intellectual character,—all the affairs, private and public, of mankind, it is agreed, equally exist,—although, in most instances, it is impossible to trace them. Any deviation from them, must, of course, be looked upon in the same manner as an exercise of special providence; and, if it could be observed by us, would be called equally a miracle. The operation of the Spirit in the imparting of divine grace, must be understood to

be an act of this nature, under the influence of religious faith. The existence and exercise of this exception stand upon the declarations in Scripture. We proceed to state what seem to us important, nay, almost conclusive, reasons against implying miraculous interference in any other case, except where miracles are used for their appropriate end, the proof of divine mission.

It is the first rule of sane theology not to call in a direct supernatural interposition, unless under the express authority of revelation, or under an acknowledged impossibility of accounting for the facts, according to God's ordinary government of the world. These interruptions of general laws must be either visible or secret. Almost every writer on the subject has shown the evil consequences which must follow from visible interpositions. The superstitious portion of mankind, however, will go on, complimenting themselves or friends with favoured blessings, and fulminating judicial pains and penalties upon the objects of their displeasure. These distinctions are often drawn in a manner so imperative, that the interposition ought to be very visible indeed, before it can be well reconciled with humility in one case, or charity in the other. Our Saviour's illustration of a sparrow not falling to the ground, &c., must show the modified sense in which strong scriptural expressions, that would seem, in the first instance, to imply a special, and not a general providence merely, ought to be understood. On the other hand, the example of the Tower of Siloam, is a practical reproof of all who think they can discriminate between punishments and misfortunes, and who thus presume to anticipate, and, in some degree, dispense with a future state. In respect of secret interpositions, Dr Balguy (p. 266) says, he sees no reason to deny (assuming that they still remain secret and undiscovered) 'that God actually interposes in such cases as are proper for us.' The condition here expressed is not so appropriately worded; but may be construed as coinciding with the more logical limitation stated by Paley and Butler. The imperfections in the world, according to their argument, are only answered by the impossibility of governing it except under general rules. It is supposed that the fact of special interpositions is cited by an objector as proof, either that the rules are not general, or that, at least, they can be interrupted. To this objection Paley could immediately reply, that he had restrained the power of unlimited interference, on the part of the Deity, to those causes which issue from himself. All unremedied imperfections ought accordingly to be placed to the account of the remaining causes; namely, to such as do not issue from him. Butler's answer to the same objection will be found to differ only in the form in which it is worded. Those



very interpositions that are cited as special, may be themselves bound by general laws, which cannot be deviated from, but in the precise excepted cases and extent, any more than the law of gravitation.

Accordingly, the fashion of writing the histories of human events, with a critical accompaniment of what were God's particular designs, is, on this further view of it, a rash experiment. It is difficult to make out an intelligible case which shall not be inconsistent with the main argument in behalf of the divine benevolence, derived from the supposed necessity of a uniform adherence to general rules. That the harmony of creation, with its 'diapason closing up in man,' 'is musical as is Apollo's lute,' we doubt as little as its most undistinguished and undistinguishing admirers. But the propriety of lowering its score to suit our scrannel pipes and broken voices, is a different question; still more, the prudence of singing our own ballad words to the choral strains of the majestic hallelujah which a mysterious nature all around us is offering up to God. We will suppose that it was in our power to waive every scruple arising out of the impenetrableness of the subject, and to subdue every doubt attaching to the possible presumption of the undertaking, 'I will not be enquired of by this people, saith the Lord.' We will suppose, further, that, among the hundred contradictory guide-posts which human imagination may set up on this vast common, and each of which claims credit for being, not only the nearest and safest, but the only road leading to the council-chamber of the Almighty, we could see our way confidently which direction was the true one. A further difficulty yet remains. If we are ready to dash with this new compass into the open sea, we must at once give up our old dawdling method of creeping along the shore of history, by marking wind, tide, and object, and keeping secondary causes carefully in sight. A government of special providences must mean one which either coincides with a government by general rules, or which does not so coincide. On the first supposition it is mere folly, when we all mean the same thing, to insist upon inventing and employing a new name, which can only mislead its followers by implying a distinction. If the language of the first chapter of Jonah is true only for the Old Testament dispensation, it is a dangerous fallacy to apply to other times and circumstances a form of speech which would justify us in throwing overboard in a storm Diagoras the atheist, on a superstition of the Greeks, or the unlucky Chaplain, on a counter-superstition of the English navy. On the other supposition, (and from the selection of examples

and of descriptive language, "evidently it is the supposition on which these histories are written,) a government of special providences is one where general rules are subject to the parentheses of constant interpositions. The effect of which interpositions is to bring about a different result from that which would have flowed out of the ordinary uninterrupted system of pre-appointed causes, under universal laws. Were these interpositions visible and discovered, it is allowed human nature must be changed, or we should be all lying around the stagnant pool of life, waiting for the descending angel to stir the waters. Assume them to be taking place but in secret, yet, if their practical operation is practically admitted, the folly of deluding ourselves in any case by an imaginary search after and connexion of a cause and its effect, is manifest, in the precise proportion of the probability that such interference has been inserted. In the case of the material world, had it been governed by special providences, disturbing even by a breath or a vibration the simple uniformity of its general laws, these general laws never could have been discovered. Upon this theory, as often as a phenomenon was discovered, which a law, hitherto supposed correct, would not account for,—instead of giving up the law as a hasty and erroneous induction, it would be a very philosophical application to the Royal Society to beg that the law might be saved entire, by considering the fact in question as a miraculous interference. In the confusion consequent upon such interruptions, natural philosophy, and all the evidence thence deduced in favour of natural religion, never could have existed. The world would have been a world of chance. Any expectations, reasonings, and conduct, that were founded upon its contingencies, must be labour thrown away. Now, general laws, however for the most part yet undiscovered by us, govern alike the constitution of our nature and the course of events. Upon the supposition that a general and continuing interference of providence takes place (not for their maintenance, but) for their suspension and modification, it follows, in like manner, that all our attempts to trace a chain of cause and effect, and to found what would have been once considered a philosophical history, comprising, through their probable connexions, all the advantage that history can confer, ought to be abandoned as an enquiry after a thing which has no actual existence. If fresh trails can be thus interposed, the chase after human probabilities is one where a moral reasoner must lose the scent at every moment. To judge by the analogy, is there not every reason rather to presume that, if the general rules of the moral could be known but as accurately as those of the physical world, we should find the

absence of special interference quite as great in one case as in the other ?

It has been thought unreasonable in Hume to insist that we cannot mark the difference between events following each other, and events dependent upon each other. However, the introduction of special providences, distinct from that of general rules, denies that the system of dependency is preserved with that uniformity which can alone authorise any general reasoning on the subject. Every course of events, instead of being the cause and effect of general rules, may be a series of immediate interpositions, which may never arise or apply again. In this case, experience must go for nothing. Things aforesaid cannot be written for our instruction, if once the proper sense, in which every believer must admit, that 'the fortune of Alexander is the Providence of God,' is misunderstood to mean a special Providence, corresponding to the fortune of the Jews. It is this exemption from general rules, which separates them and their history from all mankind as a peculiar people, and distinguishes their theocracy from that under which we all are living. The singular refractoriness of character attributed to their race, may, in part, account for the system of discipline pursued towards them. Therefore, whilst, on the one hand, its facts are no warrant to write history on the same system: on the other, the account there recorded is so little like what unassisted reason would ever have divined, that it holds out little encouragement to volunteering on the task. It is remarkable, how perfectly the previous government of this anomalous and unamalgamating nation was kept distinct from that of their fellow-creatures. The precise crisis can be ascertained (Psalm lxxiii.), at which, to the infinite embarrassment of its contemporaries, the change in the divine government of the Jews took place. By the sudden withdrawing of God's special interference, they found themselves, for the most part, put back under the same general laws as other nations. Nothing is more inexplicable than the earlier part of their history, even as qualified by Mr Millman and the German school. Itself an exception, it can never be applied as a precedent for the solving of any other case. But by far the most mischievous consequence of generalizing for daily use the anomalies recorded in the Book of Kings, is the fatal one to which we above alluded. We mean, the complete abandonment and destruction implied in it, of 'the Apology' for the divine government which has been built up by our most powerful and master hands, on the doctrine of general rules, as on its corner-stone. If the Jewish history is not a reserved case—if a power of interposition, however secret, is believed to be

in course of actual operation, there is an end to general rules, as distinguished from special providences. Nothing is clearer to our mind, as a universal proposition, than that the defence obtained by general rules against objected imperfections is thrown down, and practicable breaches are made in it, in all directions, unless the suppositions of Butler and of Paley are adopted as above, and understood to describe the metes which a special providence does not pass.

If it were possible to imagine superior natures making themselves amusement out of human follies, few things can be more thoroughly ridiculous in their eyes, than the monstrous absurdities into which generation after generation has been betrayed, by seeking to pass off its own imaginations as the views and purpose of the Almighty. Among the ancients, there were some who held that the sun was restrained from bolting out of its course by the fear of being driven back again by the Furies. Others maintained that the moon was the first receiving-house through which the souls of infants had to pass: it filled as they came in, and it waned as they were drafted off. Newton has enabled us to laugh to scorn these physical chimeras. But God's moral government is still the prey and pastime for every rash intruder; and not a year passes, but dreams and fancies are boldly hazarded, most probably not one iota less distant from the actual truth. Some persons deny evident facts; others invent imaginary ones; others again account for realities by violent exaggerations. Mr Sadler comes forward to take the part of God, as he says, against Mr Malthus; and declares that there is no such thing as a general law of population, but that by a miraculous interposition, in every successive case, the procreative power of the human race is religiously adapted to the proportion of consumers already on the ground. It follows, that whether a bride will have a family or not, depends on the number of people to the square mile, where she may happen to be staying. In like manner Dr Miller is tempted to exhibit certain events as consequences of the divine policy; although the said events preceded by about a century the cause to which they are assigned. If Mr Sadler reminds us of the naturalists who found out reasons for Charles II.'s question, why a fish should lose its weight in water; Dr Miller is more like the monk who praised God for his goodness in placing great rivers near great towns. An old lady is mentioned in the *Spectator*, who could always tell which of her neighbour's vices had blown down his barns. Our modern historians are equally in the secret wherefore this and that kingdom have been destroyed; and can whisper in your ear God's purpose in emptying out Europe upon the East in the

Crusades, or in beckoning Genghis Khan and Tamerlane from the uttermost parts of the East to the borders of the Western World.

The observations which follow, comprise a slight specimen of the mode in which our authors have sought to carry through, by main force, as it were, a portion of their impracticable task. When Dr Miller goes so far as to adopt Mr Gisborne's criticism on Dr Paley's System of Morals, and deny that the doctrine of general consequences is a sufficient security for private conduct, it is singular that he should give himself credit for the ability to determine what political consequences shall have been the aim of God's administration of the world. It may well be conceived, that these consequences are too numerous, lie too wide, and are in themselves far too subtle, to be gathered and balanced by a human hand.

Our present concern with Dr Miller is confined to his chapter upon the establishment of the Ottoman Government, (vol. iv. p. 292.) The first difficulty that arises in the view necessarily taken of this event is, the facility with which he leaves on one side so much of the enquiry as relates to the vast countries and population subjected to its sway. Their happiness or misery, in this catastrophe, is not even alluded to; but the whole philosophy of this most dramatic incident is confined to its probable and more remote effects upon the European system. The destruction of the Arabic Empire in Persia, by the suppression of the Caliphate of Bagdad, in 1258, and the decline of the Mogul dominion of Central Asia, in 1301, are treated as two intermediate arrangements, hatched up for the purpose of making room for the Ottoman throne. The Arabs are considered as having done their work, when they had sown the seeds of civilisation in Europe. A power of a different kind was wanted to harrow them in. 'Agents of another, and a much inferior description, were, therefore, at this time required for exercising, on the European system, that power of compression, which appears to have been, in all cases, necessary to the due formation of political order; agents fierce and hostile, disregarding the refinements of cultivated life, and contemptuously rejecting the intercourses by which they might be communicated.' (P. 293.) 'The Turks, neither partially civilized by a previous connexion with the surviving empires of antiquity, nor animated by the ardent influences of the climate of the south, were that ferocious and bigoted class of invaders, which was fitted neither for uniting with the Christian nations, in the formation of a common system, nor for communicating to them any new elements of social improvement; whose office was

'only to crush or to dismember; whose power could be beneficially exercised on their antagonists, only as a strong principle of repulsion is exerted in the combinations of the material world.' (P. 296.) This consolidating pressure—the imagined consequence and predetermined object of the Turkish government—is stated to have been, in its season, most important to the interests of Christendom, by the painful yet necessary discipline thus inflicted on its nations. Over and above the general benefits conferred by its principle of repulsion, three peculiar functions are discovered, by whose specific operation the purposes for which this military Power-Loom was put up, seem held to be sufficiently explained. First, it was expedient to prevent the Greek Empire from forcing for itself a superfluous and embarrassing admission into the European system. This appears to be looked on as a grand point. For, the inconvenience of bringing the decaying empire of Greece within the policy of Western Europe, is also the proper clue to the divine designs, as accomplished both in the Sicilian Vespers, and in the recovery of Constantinople by the Greeks from the Latin Crusaders. This object was finally and effectually attained in its conquest by a 'rude and unsocial' people, who separated it from all possibility of forming a connexion with the European nations, and reserved it for a future period of more extensive and more complicated relations of policy.' Secondly, it was desirable to drive into the West (where Italy at least was, after much previous preparation, just become fitted for their reception,) the teachers of the language and the learning of ancient Greece. (Ib. p. 320.) Moliere, in the *Femmes Savantes*, apparently does not overrate the value of the obtestation, *pour l'amour du Grec*. For, in like manner, the fruitless negotiations for a union between the Greek and Latin Churches, is shown, under that fallacious mask, to have been really instituted by Providence for the dissemination of Greek literature. Thirdly, the time was arrived for the encouragement of navigation. In this view of the divine policy, the conquest of Egypt and Syria was planned for stopping up the ancient routes to India, and thus forcing European enterprise into the more adventurous channel of the ocean.

The Ottoman Empire advanced regularly and rapidly, hemming in that of Greece, for a century; and Bajazet was encamped under the walls of Constantinople in 1395. The extent of the combination of events by which Providence is represented, as reprieving the Greek Empire for another fifty years, by the unexpected intervention of Tamerlane from the banks of the Ganges, depends upon a chain of what are truly described as very comprehensive, and, (it is admitted,) therefore, not very

easily discoverable relations. ‘The violent irruption of Tamerlane may be regarded as the arrangement, by which a balance was prepared for the growing power of the Ottomans; and the interval of time required for the growth of the new power of the Persians, indicates the bearing of the interruption of that of the former people.’ (310.) ‘Had the Persian Empire not been restored, the Ottoman power, when established in Europe, would have pressed with too steady a force on the system of the west, and have ruined it, instead of merely exciting the active principles of its combinations.’ (308.) The formation of the Persian Empire, on the other hand, had to wait the taking of Constantinople: ‘an earlier settlement of the Persian government might have embarrassed and obstructed that enterprise.’ (313.) The importance of the restoration of the Persian government for the protection of Europe, is afterwards represented as being first discoverable in the interruption which it gave (1480) to the invasion of Italy by Mahomed II. Political reasoners have endeavoured to point out, in the distinguishing qualities of the early Roman kings, some peculiarity by which they were successively adapted to the wants of their respective reigns. Superstitious minds saw in this adjustment more than the force of circumstances. Dr Miller, passing in review the heroes of the house of Othman, comes at last to an exception; and can account only by a special interference for the fact, that a member of this celebrated family should, after sixteen years of victory, have given ten years to repose. ‘The character of Bajazet, which was comparatively pacific, appears to have been necessary for moderating that rage of conquest, which, if unrestrained, would have carried the Ottoman government beyond those limits, within which alone its successes could be subordinate to a scheme of general improvement.’ (326.) The period supposed to be appropriated to this necessity could not reasonably be complained of by his impatient subjects, on account of its extravagant duration. Whilst the deposition and assassination of this retiring monarch by his son Selim I., must be acknowledged to be a sufficiently violent method of ascertaining that the period had expired.

This theory of the Turkish government considers its character to be formed solely with a view to its destination, and its destination to be altogether political. ‘Such a government,’ it is said, ‘was well fitted to make an alarming impression on the feudal establishments of Christian Europe; but it was also fitted, when this impression had been sufficiently made, to remain stationary, or even to become retrograde, while these were advancing in improvement, and thus to become comparatively feeble and

‘unimportant, when its activity was no longer expedient.’ We are at a loss to conjecture, what is the nature of the impression intimated in this passage. What visible effect was made at any time on the feudal establishments of Europe by the Ottoman empire? Where is the circumstance of this kind, however slight, on which a reasonable man can place his finger, and feel satisfied that he has got at the precise cluster of facts, for whose developement the previous arrangements were designed. The high office for which these facts are wanted is, that of reconciling the admitted evils brought upon the world by Zenghis Khan, Tamerlane, and the Turks, with the acknowledged moral government of the world. The more western part of Europe, where the great push for civilisation was to be made, lay so entirely beyond the vortex of this whirlpool, that, for centuries, it scarcely felt the undulation of its wave. In 1502, our Henry VII. subscribed £10,000 to Maximilian, in aid of the campaign in Hungary. Nevertheless, his great historian had surely no idea, that the Grand Turk had any thing to do, one way or the other, among the numerous circumstances which were at that period breaking up the feudal system. The countries that bore the brunt of these invasions are precisely those whose institutions are the furthest in arrear. In process of time, as nations learned to know each other, to calculate their respective forces, and anticipate projects of rivalry and ambition, the Balance of Power became a favourite object with politicians. But this mode of prudential policy, so far from being invented against the Turks, was, in point of fact, first applied against Austria; that is, against the very power which was long their most constant enemy, and whose capital they twice besieged. This was the cause, in which Francis I. availed himself of the aid of Turkish arms, and appeared as the first European sovereign after Sforza, that formed an alliance with the Sultan. At a later period, Louis XIV. was under the same anti-christian engagements, and continued so, notwithstanding the fruitless assistance he was prevailed upon to send to Candia at its siege. We have still to learn what salutary impression, external or internal, the Turkish government ever made, upon the whole, on any part of Europe. French nobles fell at Nicopolis. A Pope occasionally negotiated in vain for a Christian league. Reusnerus has collected the volumes of unavailing harangues, which were published for this purpose. There was terror enough at times; but never use. Never was there so general an arming against the Turk, as has lately been threatened in his favour.

No less imaginary are the peculiar functions that it is stated



to have performed. First, What harm would have arisen from the neighbourhood or admission, as far as could at that period be practicable, of the Greek empire into any sort of European system which then existed? Secondly, Greek learning must doubtless soon have crossed to Italy, although its professors had not been beggared, and half its treasures destroyed. The Tuscan scholars had decided that. We are not about to question the advantages derived to Europe from the study of Greek authors in the original text, instead of through the medium of Latin or Arabic translations. The difference, however, it may be submitted, is rather in manner than in matter—as a school of style and taste, than of thoughts and feelings. Homer would himself admit, that the pollution for ages of all the holy ground of classical antiquity, under barbarian despotism, was too high a price for the pleasure of reading the Iliad in Greek by the gentlemen of Thule. Condillac, no mean authority, questions the beneficial influence of Arabic learning, on account of the fashion for scholastic subtleties which it encouraged. He complains equally of the injurious consequences which followed from the exclusive devotion of the scholars of that age to the Greek language, and from the abandonment of their vulgar tongue as an instrument of elegant or serious thought. In respect to improvement of navigation, Selim I. did not conquer Egypt till 1517; and the Portuguese voyage of discovery, along the coast of Africa, began with the expedition against the Moors, when John I. conferred the order of knighthood on his sons at Ceuta in 1415. Vaquez di Gama had landed at Calicut on the coast of Malabar, in 1498; and Albuquerque had conquered Goa in 1511. So it is clear, as chronology can make it, that the occupation by the Turks of Egypt, and the obstruction of that old course of communication with India, had nothing to do with the maritime enthusiasm of the former age. In that case, the Venetians, and not the Portuguese, ought to have doubled the Cape first. In maritime discovery, the glory of the rest of Europe is not to be named with that of Spain and Portugal. These countries at least were not crusaders. Yet Mr Forster also intimates, that philosophers are now agreed on the European policy of the Crusades; and that the voyage round the Cape is to be set down as one of the benefits of the Holy War. The merchants of Tyre and Sidon, and of the Adriatic, are aware that water-carriage to India was not discovered in consequence of land-carriage being obstructed; but that, in consequence of the discovery of conveyance by water, the more tedious conveyance by land has necessarily ceased.

Mr Miller having come off so triumphantly with his historical

hypothesis, applies a similar ingenuity to the mysterious number of 666. The prophet, he observes, encourages the attempt by telling us, 'Let him that hath understanding count the 'number of the beast.' It would be well, were the dabblers in this prophetical arithmetic, such and such alone, as are here invited by the prophet. It seems, that the period that elapsed from the second Nicene Council, which authorised the worship of images, to the taking of Constantinople, is made out by a little management to be 666 years. Accordingly, the blow, which then fell on this 'idolatrous form of Christianity, in the 'very church where it originated,' identifies the Greek church with the prediction concerning the second beast. It is a slight objection to this mode of penal calculation, that the Greeks so utterly abhor all carved images, that they excommunicate their members who set foot within a Latin church, as being polluted by them, and anathematise the adorers of sculptile representations, as being things which were formerly abused to idolatry.

We proceed to the 'unveiling' of Mahomedanism. The intemperate language to which the Rev. Mr Forster treats the members of the Christian world, whose opinions do not quadrate with his own interpretation of the Scriptures, will not allow of our crediting him with any chivalrous or benevolent enthusiasm in behalf of the calumniated Mussulman, when he undertakes to prove that he is a Christian in disguise. It is to the faith of Mr Forster, and not his charity, that we owe his ambiguous patronage of this new Christian heresy. He states explicitly the dilemma to which he found himself reduced. He pronounces it to be just as impossible to account for the rise and success of Mahomet, as for the propagation of Christianity, by merely human causes. The failure of previous attempts to overcome this difficulty, by such arguments as rejected a special providence, led him to the conclusion, that a special providence had interposed. He soon discovered that direct evidence to this effect existed in the Old Testament. Every one is aware, that a two-fold promise was made by God to Abraham, in behalf of his sons Isaac and Ishmael. By the terms of this promise, 'a blessing' is annexed to the prosperity of each, as a mark of divine favour towards the seed of Abraham. They are to become great nations, signally connected with the providential history and government of mankind.\* The

---

\* (Lee's Persian Controversy, p. 277-541.) Mr Forster's claim on the part of Ishmael reminded us of the prophetical version already recognised in the Mosques of Persia. The Moolah, of whose remarkable opponency kept against Mr Martyn at Shiraz, we have so interesting an account, insisted that several predictions in the Pentateuch could not possibly relate

greater promise made to Isaac has received a temporal and spiritual fulfilment; first, in the establishment of the Jews in Canaan, and afterwards in the propagation of Christianity. The lesser promise to Ishmael has had no analogous fulfilment; unless it be in the rise of Mahomet, and in the temporal and spiritual establishment of his creed. It becomes, therefore, of the utmost importance, to demonstrate a corresponding analogy in the facts that respectively constitute this alleged fulfilment of the two parallel covenants. With this view, the analogy between Judaism and Christianity, on one hand, and Mahomedanism, on the other, is traced through twelve elaborate sections. The position hitherto occupied by Mahomedanism, in its capacity as a middle term between Christianity and Paganism, is of course only intermediate. But whilst we are waiting for this further consummation in the conversion of its own communion to the more perfect faith, its immediate usefulness as a necessary half-way house, and the sole efficient instrument for the conversion of the heathen, is shown in a pointed manner. The gospel scheme, it is admitted, is unsuitable to the condition and capabilities of uncivilized nations. The failure of Christian missionaries to barbarous countries, is contrasted with the striking success of Mahomedanism. It thus discharges the servile, indeed, but necessary functions of a pioneer. In the mean time, notwithstanding its approach to Christianity in so many features, and its special toleration of Christians, Mr Forster allows that Islamism has hitherto surpassed all the forms of Paganism itself, in a bigoted resistance to the propagation of the gospel. This perverseness is compared with the similar case of Judaism. It is remarked upon, as a singular characteristic of two creeds, emanating—one, by divine appointment, the other, by providential permission—from Isaac and Ishmael. The common origin points to a common end; and their final coming in is looked for in the simultaneous result, not of ordinary means, but of extraordinary providential interposition.

---

to any prophet who had appeared since the time of Moses, except Mohammed. Professor Lee admits the erroneous ingenuity of the argument, that 'as Mohammed was descended from Ishmael, he may be properly and exclusively, therefore, considered as the prophet there foretold, who should arise from among the brethren of Isaac's posterity.' The Moolah infers, that Jesus, being himself descended from the children of Israel, cannot be intended, where their brother or brother's son is mentioned; and accordingly that Mohammed must be meant, as alone being descended from Ishmael, his brother. Probably he would come to an understanding with Mr Forster, and compromise the matter upon the lesser blessing being secured to him, in a shape that he could really recognise as a blessing.

Important results must follow from this discovery, were it once believed and acted upon. If Mahomedanism is truly entitled to the pedigree and the praise bestowed upon it by Mr Forster, and if it constitute, in point of fact, the only intermediate stepping-stone from Heathenism to Christianity, our Societies ought to pause and divide their labours. A wing of Bartlett's Buildings should be devoted to the printing cheap Korans, and sending missionary Moolahs to the heathen. The first point will be to make Mussulmans. That is so much gained. Our work with the Mahomedan world ought to commence only afterwards, or the poor idolaters are left in the lurch for ever.

Another, and, it would seem, the principal practical advantage that Mr Forster attributes to his theory, is the facility it is to afford the eastern missionary for Mahomedan conversion. The period is probably yet far distant, when it will be necessary to remember our caution on the propriety of keeping back a sufficient stock of Mussulmans in reserve, for the purpose of bringing in the heathens. Could the didactics here displayed really touch the heart and understanding of a Mussulman doctor, this pertinacious breed must be far too accommodating, in regard to controversial courtesy, as well as logic, to need new instructions about the best method of approaching them at the present day. There is another impression, and we fear a much more probable one, which a Turk, or other heretic, can scarce help receiving from portions of this work. Nothing is so likely to drive away an incipient convert as the mutual squabbles, slanders, and persecutions, which the different sects of the Christian church indulge in towards each other. If Greek and Armenian, Copt and Roman Catholic, present in the East itself a scene of no great edification or attraction, whilst fighting and intriguing for the tax and rental of their holy places, what must a Mussulman enquirer feel, on finding that these scandalous altercations equally vex and discredit us in our western home? Mr Forster might learn the necessity of charity to other modes of interpreting the Christian volume besides his own, when he finds that a religious Journal has already designated these sad and solemn fruits of nine years' zealous scrutiny, as 'a vile infidel publication.' Nor surely ought he to start at Dr Elrington's avowal, as a Roman Catholic bishop, that, rather than assent to a union of the Gallican and English churches, 'he would be tempted to remove the cross and set up the crescent.' For what does Professor Lee tell the Persians, but that 'the Roman Catholics have lost almost all that distinguishes Christianity from Heathenism?' Does not, also, Mr Forster's own decla-

ration and whole argument mean precisely the same thing? What else can a Turk understand, when he is informed that the Papal and Mahomedan power, conjointly and exclusively, realize their parallel predictions,—wonderfully synchronize in their origin,—symbolize in their attributes,—and continue up to the present hour, in their indications, faithfully and fearfully to correspond? So much for the greater half of ancient Christendom. In regard to the most growing form of Christianity in the new world, Mr Forster also expressly lays it down, that Mahomedans ‘approach more nearly to the Gospel than Socinus, or his imitators, and outrunners, the modern Unitarians; since Mahomedanism strenuously maintains several prime articles of the Catholic faith, which those presumptuous innovators strenuously deny.’ Bigotry, on whatever side, is equally disagreeable to us. We are sure that Mr Forster is much too just as well as kind a person, to hold himself entitled to a monopoly of harsh and cruel inferences, because he is a member of the Established Church, and Chaplain to a Bishop.

English divinity has been long reproached for its sluggishness, timidity, and routine. From some, at least, of these faults the Irish branch of it seems likely to be emancipated. In excuse of the extreme caution, and almost mechanical orthodoxy, of the English Universities, it must be allowed that novelties in scriptural interpretations are suspicious. The novelty, in the present instance, which has created, and naturally enough, a great sensation, is no exception. Mr Forster proposes to raise the promise, that Ishmael should become ‘a great nation,’ to a higher acceptance, than among Christians it had yet received. The temporal greatness of Ishmael’s Saracen descendants, and the unsubjugated independence of the Arab tribes, fade into comparative insignificance, if the eye of faith may recognise in these predictions the spiritual ascendancy of Mahomet and his religion, under the triumphant character of a prophet and a revelation, promised and foretold. This innovation, which the Unitarians will probably consider a presumptuous one, is announced by the very title of *Mahomedanism unveiled*. The old distinctions concerning the Divine dispensations, in regard to the two sons of Abraham, went upon the principle of discriminating between the covenant and the promise; that is, between religion and mere secular dominion. Esau and Jacob, Ishmael and Isaac, shared the last together: the former was vested in Isaac solely. So far from there being any thing of a religious nature implied in the promise made on behalf of Ishmael, the language, when contrasted with that applied to Isaac, appears studiously to exclude it. So far from the promise made in favour of his offspring be-

ing yet outstanding, unless it has been accomplished in the person of Mahomet, we doubt whether there is a Bible with annotations any where in Christendom, which has not considered its accomplishment as perfected in the history of the Arabs; usually regarded as only one degree less remarkable than the prophetic destiny of the Jews. We are sure at least that the system, which it is now proposed to substitute in its place, is supported by much slighter evidence, as well as open to much more serious objections. Our objections may be classed under three heads: One derived from the *Epistle to the Galatians*; another from the nature of the promise; the third from the faintness of the prophetic allusions magnified into proofs.

In the first place, St Paul has anticipated, and expressly appropriated, the allegorical and spiritual intimation, (the religious creed, as distinguished from the worldly prosperity,) comprised in the respective fortunes of Ishmael and Isaac. St Paul confines the *special* application of the peculiar case of Ishmael to the *spiritual* condition of the Jews, and to a law of bondage; which he forcibly compares with the condition of Christians, and the Gospel-law of freedom, as represented under the privileges of Isaac. Nothing but the express authority of the apostle would have warranted the spiritual application of these family transactions by way of allegory to the Jews; considering that the secular relationship of Ishmael was already fixed elsewhere, and his actual pedigree had branched off in an entirely different direction to the Arabs. The temporal and the religious destination of two separate portions of mankind, may be intelligibly represented in the separate parts of the history of Ishmael, as being two things in their nature absolutely distinct. But it is scarcely credible, that the destination of two religions, (opposites of the same nature,) should be wrapped up and represented either in the same facts, or in successive facts, dependant on, and derived from, the history of the same person. At least, a warrant similar to that of the apostle appears to us to be just as necessary before we ought to be called upon to annex another *special spiritual application*, if not in contradiction to, certainly greatly to the confusion and perplexity of, the former. According to this scheme, the birth and life of Ishmael signify, in the first instance, the Law of Moses; whilst the promise made to him changes hands immediately, and is introduced afterwards in the new character of the Law of Mahomet. The apparent contrariety and actual awkwardness of the alternation, in which this hypothesis supposes Ishmael to pass, backward and forward, into the interest, real or figurative, of two hostile creeds, is a difficulty which is not to be gratuitously presumed. After the emblematic

solution communicated by the apostle, no room seems left for any other ulterior *religious comment*, than the general practical observation made by Dr Scott, namely, that all 'born of the flesh,' and not of the spirit, are still under the covenant of works—Ishmaelites, Bond-Slaves, and Citizens of the earthly Jerusalem. Every thing in Mr Forster's book that can, in the slightest degree, tend to lifting up the veil from Mahomedanism, depends on the probability of this Ishmaelitish theory being correct. To show that the account in Genesis is allegorical, he himself appeals to the above Epistle, which (he says) 'represents the distinct covenants of the 'Old and New Testaments as having been allegorised under the 'opposite covenants and characters of Ishmael and Isaac.' Accordingly, he quotes the three verses (chap. iv. 22—24.) which prove that the history of Ishmael had an allegorical aspect. Considering the admission in the above passage, it is unaccountable that he should stop short, and not proceed to quote the succeeding verse, in which the apostle declares so positively the meaning of the allegory. The covenant with Ishmael having been described as one from 'Mount Sinai, which is Agar,' St Paul continues: 'For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to 'Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.' It is generally agreed, we believe, that parts of the Bible are uninspired. The true line between the inspired and uninspired portions must be frequently of difficult application. The distinction, however, ought certainly to have kept Galileo out of the Inquisition. In case Mr Forster's explanation were irreconcilable with that to which he thus refers, he will be entitled also to the benefit of it, provided his argument is half as conclusive as Galileo's. In the mean time, in explaining the same transaction, if St Paul's authority is to be admitted for a part of it, it must be admitted for the whole. In case his word decides that there is a mystical meaning conveyed under the historical one, his word is equally decisive upon the further fact; namely, what that mystical meaning really is. It is sought to learn what is the precise mode in which a scriptural allegory has been realized. St Paul says, it was realizing in his time at Jerusalem; Mr Forster says it has been subsequently realized at Mecca. Our author apparently intends to combine both. For, whilst alluding to the allegorical interpretation previously given by St Paul, he immediately subjoins in italics,—'that prophecy represents Ishmael as the father of a *religion of persecution*.' He might have remembered, that in itself this is, unfortunately, typical of no particular religion. It is more singular that he should not have noticed the construction adopted, not generally, but specially by the apostle,—'even so it is now;' that is, the Jews being under the

legal covenant, were persecuting the Christians who had passed under the new one. If St Paul, thus interpreted, is right, Mr Forster's whole system must be wrong; unless on the supposition, that as the destiny of Ishmael connects itself historically with the promised national greatness of his descendants, and allegorically with the Jewish Law, it may be further interpreted to comprehend the Mahomedan Law also. This mode of tacking on a supplemental reference and operation, is that which we imagine Mr Forster must propose. By this means, he is saved indeed from any actual collision. But the circuit which it is necessary to take, in order that this further hypothesis may be made concurrent and consistent with the explanation already revealed in the scriptures, is too remote and doubtful to justify a desertion of the direct and ancient path. The supposition of a *double spiritual interpretation* introduces so much uncertainty into a subject in itself sufficiently abstruse, and is exposed to such abuse, (for if there may be a double interpretation, why not a third, and so on *ad infinitum*?) that nothing could render it admissible but a necessity which we had before never heard surmised. The promise made to Ishmael requires, as such, no further temporal fulfilment than is contained in the wonderful successes of the Arabs. The allegorical fulfilment (which might have been hoped to be thus protected from further interference) it was the express object of the apostle, in the above chapter, to reveal. The Church of England has expressed no doubt in this respect, either in the Common-place-book notes, compiled by Drs Mant and D'Oyly, or in the argumentative commentary of Dr Scott. The concluding advice given by the latter on the subject of this allegory, deserves to have been more attended to. 'We should not perhaps have discovered this allegory in the history of Sarah and Hagar, if the apostle had not shown it to us: and much sobriety and discretion ought to be used in thus applying scriptural narrations; yet this transaction was so remarkable, the coincidence so exact, and the illustration so instructive, that we cannot doubt it was originally intended, by the Holy Spirit, as an allegory, and type of those things to which the inspired prophet referred it: and it should be observed, that it was used as an *illustration* of the subject under consideration, and not as a direct *argument* or proof of it.'

Our next objection depends on the nature of the promise as compared with its supposed fulfilment. Notwithstanding the compliment Mr Forster pays to Mahomedanism, by representing it as having joined hand in hand with Christianity in the general advancement of civilisation in every quarter of the globe, he applies to it the established terms of tra-



ditional contempt. So far, however, unkind as this language to our colleagues seems, it is still intelligible. But we cannot extend this concession to his vituperation of Mahomedanism, when contemplated according to his scriptural scheme. Opprobrious epithets are absolutely irreconcilable with the character of a system that is described as being expressly promised to Ishmael as a blessing. No sufficient reason is assigned for classing, as above, the creed of the Old Testament under a divine appointment, and that of the Koran under a providential permission only. Considering the line of scriptural argument taken by Mr Forster, we do not see where any room is left for a distinction, at all times most unsatisfactory, nor what use he can, in fairness, make of it. He calls the Koran a revelation; but, as contrasted with that of Christianity, which he still regards to be the only legitimate and true one, he calls it a spurious revelation. The word may figuratively contrast the promise which was made to the son of the free woman, with that which was made to the son of the bond. It marks the original inferiority of the party. But it is impossible, either in reverence or courtesy, to apply such language to a revelation made by God himself, in the accomplishment of a covenant,—that covenant being a blessing and a special favour. A plunge of this kind makes short work with the oil consumed by learned men in constructing couples, wherein God's prescience and grace should run in peaceable union with man's free will and evil propensities. The absolute decree of vice and error imputed to Calvin's doctrine was incredible enough. It is here far out-calvinised. Sin and error are made a positive matter, not only of pre-arrangement, but of express covenant and reward. The most latitudinarian interpretation of a Divine blessing can scarcely include an order of things which is, in the very same pages, hunted down in terms, to ordinary ears, partaking somewhat of the nature of a curse. It is the 'arch heresy.' It is 'the most deadly and devastating apostasy with which the 'justice of heaven ever visited the sons of men.' It is a 'carnal religion of sensuality, pride, and violence, low morality, 'slavish rites, the bondage of a bloody and enslaving superstition.' Surely these are hard words, when it is recollected they are descriptive of a special mark of Divine favour, and of its fulfilment. Notwithstanding the providential rank assigned to Mahomedanism, as the pre-appointed scourge of Heathenism, Abraham would have been probably a little disappointed, had he learned that this magnificent promise was to be realized, by making him the forefather of a false prophet, and the source of a spurious faith—the great federal head, whence was to arise

‘ the confederation of a temporal and spiritual tyranny, for the ‘ persecution and subversion of the true religion during 1200 ‘ years !’ No possible subtlety of explanation can get over the startling objections interwoven with the mere statement of this singular experiment in theological quixotism. The instances of a double faith, mentioned by Mr Madden, in Turks who believed in their own creed, and also in Christianity, appeared singular signs of a comprehensive spirit in the eyes of that lively traveller. But they are by no means so inconsistent, or so marvellous, as the case of an ingenious and amiable author, who can compose two learned volumes to make out that Mahomedanism is a promise, a revelation, and a blessing, and then finish by denouncing it to be spurious, and a judgment on the sins of men !

Lastly, the traces of a supposed similitude between the prophetical allusions, and the events with which it is the object of the present Theory to identify them, are too minute and feeble, we should have thought, even to deserve an elaborate investigation, much less to support a judicial opinion in its favour.

Mr Forster deprecates the curious theory and cumbrous erudition by which modern writers on prophecy have confused and trodden out ‘ the footmarks of our Medes and Newtons.’ He scorns the compliment paid the times in which we happen to live as being necessarily a great era of prophetical fulfilments. We share all his ‘ displacency at their presumptuous tone ;’ and appreciate the prudent reserve which repeated errors and discomfitures will beat at last even into themselves, in matter of such easy detection and unfortunate notoriety as dates. At the same time, it is much to be regretted that his caution is confined within such narrow limits. He has himself dashed into the general subject of prophetical exposition, with a precipitancy which must tend to destroy in many minds all confidence in prophecy whatever. Such must be the effect produced, as far as any effect is produced, by his main theory, of Mahomedanism being the blessing promised to Ishmael. Such, too, however, authorised in part by learned predecessors, his application of the two little Horns and the two Beasts to what he calls the two Christian heresies of the West and East. Boyle certainly would not have to complain of the present times that there are fewer than he could wish, ‘ who ‘ make it their business to search the Scriptures for unheeded ‘ prophecies, overlooked mysteries, and strange harmonies.’ The words in Daniel characterizing the prophetic king, that ‘ by peace ‘ he shall destroy many,’ are said to be exemplified in the ‘ fatal ‘ effects of a treacherous toleration on Christianity in Spain,’ which led to the intermarriage of Christian and Mussulman subjects. Also, ‘ at a later period, the formation of the Janissaries,

‘at once the offspring and the scourge of Christendom, presents ‘a still more awful fulfilment of this prediction.’ The Revelations represent the prophetic Horses as vomiting out of their mouths ‘fire, smoke, and brimstone,’ by which ‘the third part ‘of man was killed.’ This prediction is understood to be fulfilled by the early advantage which Mahomet II. took of the invention of artillery in the siege of Constantinople. The introduction of fire-arms is, on the contrary, usually mentioned by profane writers as an improvement in the military art which has been fatal to the comparative strength of the Turkish armies. At this rate, there is scarcely any conclusion that might not be reached by a little cleverness in the selection, and a little fancy in the ornament, of a few favourite facts. In the meantime, the interpreters are at war among each other, disputing on a hundred points. They are not even agreed what are the appropriate signs of Antichrist; and whether the second little Horn means the Greek empire that is destroyed, or the Turkish empire which was its destroyer;—which Turkish empire, the Greek church, by the hands of its Russian communion, appears ere long destined in its turn to destroy. Whilst in one page it is stated, that History contains few more striking fulfilments of prophecy than the driving back of the Turks of the four Sultanies (the Four Angels) into the Euphrates, it is complained of soon afterwards in another, that the modern school denies there ever existed four Turkish Sultanies at all!

This method, of what our sincere respect for Mr Forster’s motives will not allow us to call trifling with a main proof of Christianity, cannot be indulged in with impunity. It exceedingly embarrasses all inquisitive and sober thinkers that have not satisfied their minds from other sources. It must weaken in the hands of Christian advocates (especially in oriental warfare) a weapon, one of the most powerful as long as it is wisely wielded. Mr Forster, in common with other Christians, anticipates the spiritual downfall of Mahomedanism. Independent of the moral pre-eminence of the Gospels, (an argument of all the most convincing, but which it requires a considerable degree of cultivation to comprehend,) the great external evidences of the Christian religion can be nothing but its miracles and prophecies. A careful reader of an excellent book, upon *Miracles*, by Mr Penrose, will see the extreme difficulty of using them, generally, as a proof of divine mission, wherever a nation admits an ordinary visible exercise of superhuman power, in acts unconnected, and even at variance with divine authority. In such a case, before miracles are appealed to, a steady line between power superhuman and divine must be previously drawn.

Every volume of modern travels shows how universally popular the notion of a superhuman power is over the East. Every Frank is considered to be a magician. Captain Frankland was made to act as one in his own defence. There is scarce a village whose Sheik is not a sorcerer. It is evident from Mr Martin's Persian Controversy, published by Professor Lee, that the apostolic zeal even of Mr Martin could make no way with any argument from miracles, which the Mahomedan doctors could so easily evade. Our other great reliance must be placed, therefore, upon prophecy. It was given us for this very purpose.

Assuredly the prophecies are not so many flights of Eastern poetry to excite the enthusiasm of believers, nor fields of vague conjecture, over which a warm imagination is to run riot. Our intellectual strength is not tasked by Providence to toil all night, and catch nothing, in labouring to discover what God would certainly have made intelligible had he intended to reveal. Nor are they historical riddles, set up by a sphynx to try the comparative ingenuity, and amuse the solitary studies of learned men. Prophecy spreads a cloud over the facts which it announces. It is vain to hope to dispel that cloud before the destined hour of prophetical fulfilment. On the other hand, it is contrary to the very end of prophecy to suppose, that the cloud is to remain, after the fulfilment has taken place; so that the form and manner of the fulfilment should admit of long critical debate. It will not be a struggle on that solemn day between conflicting doctors, to decypher among a crowd of equally plausible hypotheses, which of them approaches the nearest to the figurative similitudes and antiquarian allusions of a text. There will be no stretching of suspected facts upon the rack of history for false confessions. A prophecy and its accomplishment are appealed to by God, as constituting, together, the proof of his foreknowledge and his power. Two things are necessary in order to answer this great purpose. The subject to which it relates must lie beyond the reach of human sagacity. Next, the coincidence between the thing foretold, and the thing performed, must be so clear and complete, that all competent judges will agree upon the coincidence as soon as it is fairly pointed out. Every interpreter who burdens a prophecy with a hasty interpretation, which next year he has to retract—every theorist who presses into the service minute and doubtful particles of metaphorical expression, capable of a hundred meanings, is most mischievously employed. He puts snares in the student's path, and extinguishes the lantern from before our feet: or rather misleads us by false lights to a fatal shipwreck upon a shallow and rocky shore. A claim of divine authority founded upon prophecy, when rejected

from the inadequacy of the proofs, must act in the same way as a similar claim founded on miracles rashly alleged and imperfectly established. A Mahomedan would immediately oppose to it some such example as that of the vulgar predictions so long floating in the East; the accomplishment of which does not now seem likely to be long delayed.

We cannot conclude our present warning against the folly of descending from the high vantage ground of the Christian faith, and pouring the very lees of human imaginations into the cup of Christian revelation, better than by showing the universality and consistency of the singular historical tradition here alluded to. Gibbon (vol. x, p. 233) describes the deep impression left by the arctic fleets in the eleventh century, on the imperial city. 'By the vulgar of every rank it was asserted and believed that an equestrian statue in the square of Taurus was secretly inscribed with a prophecy, how the Russians in the last days should become masters of Constantinople. Perhaps the present generation may yet behold the accomplishment of the prediction; of a rare prediction, of which the style is unambiguous and the date unquestionable.' In the note he quotes his Byzantine authorities, and the anonymous writer, *De antiquitat. C. P.* who lived about the year 1100. 'They witness the belief of the prophecy, the rest is immaterial. The brazen statue which had been brought from Antioch and was melted down by the Latins, was supposed to represent either Joshua or Bellerophon,—an odd dilemma.' Ludovico Domenichi relates a Turkish prophecy concerning the destruction of the Ottoman Empire by the Christians. He subjoins a translation and a commentary in his *Prophet. dei Maometani*, published at Florence as far back as 1548. 'It is to be observed,' he adds, 'that this prophecy is not to be found in the Koran, but in other books to which they give great authority and reverence.'

Dr Walsh (*Journey from Constantinople to England*) gives, in his appendix (436), two copies of an extraordinary document; one being the original, and consisting of words, composed almost entirely of consonants; the other its interpretation, as said to be given by Gennadius, the first patriarch of Constantinople, after its capture by the Turks. It is believed to have been copied from an ancient tomb of Constantine the Great. After stating that it is not only circulating among Greeks and Turks at present, but has been in circulation for at least a century—Dr Walsh strangely adds, that, *if the prophecy be of recent date*, or the latter part of it recently added, the individual mentioned there must be Constantine. His mother had him so baptised, for the express purpose of meeting a super-

stitious coincidence of fatal names, on which also the Turks have great reliance. The English translation is very Christian in its style. ‘On the first of the Indict, the kingdom of Ishmael, he who is called Mahomet shall overturn the race of the Palæologi, shall gain possession of the seven-hilled (city). He shall reign within it,—shall subdue very many nations, and shall desolate the islands as far as the Euxine sea. He shall lay waste those who border the Danube. On the eighth of the Indict, he shall subdue the Peloponnesus. On the ninth of the Indict, he shall lead his forces against the countries of the north. On the tenth of the Indict, he shall overthrow the Dalmatæ. Again, he shall turn back for yet a time; he stirs up a mighty war against the Dalmatians, and is a little broken (or *crushed*), and the people, and tribes, with the assistance of the Western nations, shall engage in war by sea and land, and shall overthrow Ishmael. His descendants shall reign with less, little, very little (power). But the yellow-haired race, together with all their coadjutors, shall overthrow Ishmael, and shall take the seven-hilled (city), with its (imperial) privileges. Then shall they kindle a fierce intestine war, until the fifth hour, and thrice shall a voice shout, stand! stand! and fear (to proceed) make anxious haste; and on your right hand you will find a man, noble, admirable, and courageous: him ye shall have for your lord, for he is my friend, and, in accepting him, my will is fulfilled.’ This prophecy is evidently the same which is mentioned by Mr Eton, in his *Survey of the Turkish Empire*, as foretelling that the Russians, under the title of the *Sons of Yellowness*, will take Constantinople. Notwithstanding the oriental tinge of the expression, Mr Thornton, (whose animosity towards his predecessor, whether right or wrong, is one of the great disfigurements of his own work, the *Present State of Turkey*), refers to this prophecy in his index as a traveller’s fabrication. Its antiquity, however, stands upon unquestionable grounds. The following passage is cited by Mr Forster in his final notes. ‘Wallachius, in *Vitâ Mahometis* (p. 158) refert, *Turcas hodie nos in annalibus suis legere, tamdiu perstiturum regnum Muhammedicum, donec veniant figliuoli biondi; i.e. flavi et albi filii, vel filii ex Septentrione, flavis et albis capillis, secundum aliorum interpretationem; utri autem Sueci hic intelligendi, ceu volunt nonnulli, aliis discutiendum relinquo.*’ Schultens, *Eccles. Muham, Brev. Delin.* p. 22. Argent. 1668.’

Rolamb, who was Swedish envoy at Constantinople in 1657, relates that the Turks had then ‘a particular suspicion against the Swedish nation, it being written in their prophecies that their empire shall be destroyed by a northern nation.’ The

mode by which this prophecy was expected to be fulfilled is droll enough, in reference to present probabilities. The Turks were to take Rome; the Pope to be soon after made patriarch of Jerusalem, and turn Mahomedan; then Christ was to come down, and confirm the Koran; after which, the Turks were to decline and retire into Arabia, and the world was to end. A very pleasant application of this theory is to be found in the remarkable Letters addressed, during the miraculous campaign of 1683, by that admirable example of Christian chivalry, John Sobieski, to a wife apparently very unworthy of such a correspondent. ‘The Pashas, our prisoners, whilst talking with the Starost of Culm, asked him—‘Well, what are you going to do next? We expected you would return home after the victory of Vienna.’ The Starost answered, ‘We mean to continue the war till we have recovered all the country which you had conquered from the Christians.’ We are well aware, they replied, that it is God who has raised up your king to punish us. But this conduct does not at all correspond with what is written in our Holy Books. It is we who ought first to conquer all Christendom. Your turn will come afterwards. Why are you in such a hurry? Are you impatient for the last day? for it is said in our Books, that the moment the Christians get the better, and the Turks are conquered, the end of the world will come. Well, would you wish it to come so soon? The Starost, laughing, told them that we were in no fear of the day of judgment, and should not stop pursuing them.’

Pietro della Valle travelled in the east from 1615 to 1626. In one of his Letters he states, that the motive which led him into Persia to the court of Shah Abbas, was a desire to form a league between the Persians and Cossacks (not the Muscovites, of whom and their embassy he speaks with comparative contempt) against the Turk. Mentioning the various exploits of that tribe on the Black Sea, he says that they were animated in this undertaking by prophecies current among them, wherein they were pointed out as the people fated to destroy the Turkish Empire, and restore that of the Greeks.

*The Present State of the Greek Church*, by Rycant, was written in 1678; consequently, previous to the reforms introduced by Peter the Great into the Russian Church Establishment. His words are, (p. 83.) ‘Though the Muscovites and Russians have their own Patriarch of late years, yet they acknowledge a particular respect and reverence to the See of Constantinople, to which they have recourse for counsel and direction, in all difficult points controverted in religion; and the Greeks on the other side have an esteem and affection for the Muscovites, as

‘ for those whom Ancient Prophecies mention to be designed by  
‘ God, for their avengers and deliverers in after ages.’

There can be no question of the policy of the Russians in now seeking to appropriate to themselves the excitement of a prediction so long wavering among rival neighbours whom it has since outgrown or swallowed up. In 1769, a pamphlet was published at Petersburg, entitled, ‘ The Fall of the Turkish Empire, predicted by the Arab astrologer, Moustá Eddin.’ The Sultan Soliman (it is not said which) threw the unlucky author into the sea. A collection of curious predictions concerning the same event, was published at Moscow, we suppose as a sort of *Piece justificative*, in 1828. It contains another by one Mustin Zadeck.

It is needless to observe, of prophecies of this description, that the original presumption was probably in their favour at the time of their composition, and that they directly tend to their own accomplishment. When once set agoing, they roll on like descending avalanches, and gather fresh force at every bound, till the victim is crushed beneath their weight. The chief Turkish burying ground for Constantinople is at Scutari, on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus; partly, because, their holy places being in Asia, it is comparatively holy ground; but principally, because the dying wish to provide for their remains a resting place beyond the limits of these predictions. The effect of such a notion upon this nation of predestinarians must be very great. Dr Russel, in his excellent account of Aleppo, published about the middle of last century, states that the Turks often mention this prophecy, and appear seriously to believe it. Captain Kiuneir met with it under the walls of Iconium in 1813. Whilst he was examining the reliefs, ‘ an ‘ unwieldy Turk, with a protuberant belly and erect carriage,’ slowly advanced towards him with his pipe and servant, to learn why he was looking so earnestly at the figures. This dignified personage in return informed him, that ‘ his family ‘ were once powerful in Iconium, but that of late years the ‘ greatness of the Osmanlis had declined also, and he feared that ‘ a prophecy, which foretold the destruction of their power, would ‘ soon be realized.’

It is a singular proof of the overflowing superstition natural to the Turks, that having stepped into the estate of the Greek Emperors, they should, as a matter of course, have taken up this their fabulous and legendary fortune, as an inevitable mortgage, bound by destiny, on the imperial succession.

The earliest of these prophecies is, evidently, not so much a vague anticipation of the conquests of the North over the



South, (a geographical probability, of which the world has had sufficient experience,) as a terrible tradition of the narrow, and, as was even then considered, providential escape of Constantinople, from the indefatigable assaults of these same barbarian invaders. The wonder is, that the Russians should have ripened so slowly on their northern wall. Between the years 865 and 1043, the Russian canoes descended on four several expeditions down the Boristhenes into the Bosphorus. Their leader, Swatislas, crossed the Balkan, and preceded General Diebitsch in the occupation of Adrianople, as far back as the year 973. It is singular, therefore, that out of the ten sieges which Constantinople has already sustained, the two only successful ones should have been the work of other armies, and that the final triumph of the Muscovite over the capital of Constantine has yet to come. It would not be respited a day later, were any form of Christian worship, Greek or Roman, to displace the Imaum from before the altar of St Sophia. Poland and Warsaw were not Mahomedan. Consequently, whenever the Russian cross shall enter through the breach made by Mahomet the second, nearly five hundred years ago, we suspect that the ancient prophecy of Taurus will be more closely connected with the real cause of this great historical revolution, than modern prophecies, steaming from the vaticinatory tripod of Dr Miller, Mr Forster, or a yet wilder school.

ART.II.—1. *The Speech of M. T. SADLER, Esq. M.P., on the State and Prospects of the Country, delivered at Whitby.* 8vo. London, 1829.

2. *Storia della Economia Pubblica in Italia, de GIUSEPPE PECCHIO.* 8vo. Lugano, 1829.

‘ **I**T is with fear and trembling that we announce to our readers  
 ‘ the alarming position in which they are placed. We doubt  
 ‘ whether our philosophical countrymen north of the Tweed,  
 ‘ are aware of their past and present perils. We learn, upon  
 ‘ the unquestionable authority of many most venerable friends  
 ‘ of the Constitution in Church and State, that a dangerous con-  
 ‘ spiracy has been formed, more fatal than have been the schemes  
 ‘ of the Carbonari to the Holy Alliance, or the devices of Cap-  
 ‘ tain Rock to the worshipful company of Irish Tithe-Proctors.  
 ‘ Men of all classes have lent their aid to the vile purposes of  
 ‘ this guilty confederacy. They have obtained admission into

‘ the Magistracy, the Legislature, and the Cabinet. Even the Church and the Seats of Learning have not been exempt from their mischievous influence. These dangerous and designing men call themselves the Society of Political Economists. Having contributed to destroy the Constitution of 1688, by introducing a free trade in religion, they are now intent on breaking down those bulwarks which the wisdom of our ancestors erected for the protection of our agriculture, manufactures, navigation, and commerce. As might be anticipated, the factious Opposition have lent themselves to these designs ; but what is still more fatal, the infection has extended to Whitehall, and Downing Street. Mr Huskisson and Mr Grant were not more formidable than are the Duke of Wellington and his colleagues, and the inscriptions which Mr Vesey Fitzgerald has traced on Mr Courtenay’s ‘ *white paper* ’ at the Board of Trade, deprive that department of any claims on the confidence of the orthodox country gentlemen. The author of a pamphlet on Currency is made a Bishop. An expositor of the Apocalypse recommends cheap corn. A Professor disseminates these atrocious doctrines at Oxford. Wise men from the East,—modern peripatetics,—deliver their lectures with pertinacious activity. The London University, the Society for diffusing Useful Knowledge, Mechanics’ Institutes, Encyclopædias, Treatises, Essays, Pamphlets, and Reviews, all labour in the same cause. Death has rescued England from the hands of one political Jacobin, but she may yet fall a victim to commercial Jacobinism, unless saved by the Speeches of Mr Sadler, and the Letters of the Duke of Newcastle.’

We have endeavoured to give a faithful representation of the present opinions of the Ultra Tories, though in language more moderate than theirs. ‘ The Political Economists,’ the new philosophers repeat, ‘ have filled England with insolvency, starvation, crime, convulsion, and in a word, with all the elements of national barbarism, bankruptcy, and revolution.’ Any reduction of duty on foreign goods is called ‘ robbery and spoliation ;’ a vested interest is discovered to exist in every anomaly and abuse ; and the whole vocabulary of the ‘ *canina facundia* ’ is put in requisition, to vilify and traduce many of our most eminent writers and statesmen.

The substitution of a party badge, for a convincing argument, has long been practised. No Jew bill, Chartered Rights for ever, Church and State, No Popery, and No Free Trade, are, in modern times, what were the cries of St George and St Dennis in the days of chivalry. If we could conceive that the literary and political opponents of, what has been called, Free Trade, were ear-

nest in their opinions, or candid in their reasoning, we might pity, though we could scarcely forgive them. But, we are loth to think so meanly of their understanding, as to place any great reliance on their sincerity. It is hardly possible that they can believe the doctrines they profess and preach. When the improvement and extension of machinery have, in their first operations, diminished the wages of labour, and thrown more produce into the market than the existing state of the commercial law enables the consumer to take off, this is imputed as a crime to Mr Huskisson. When the cessation of a naval war has restored to foreign countries a share in navigation of which they were deprived by our monopoly, this is considered the act of Mr Grant. When the enormous extension of the production of silk, encouraged perhaps by the inconsiderate repayment of duties, has lowered prices and wages, this is supposed to be the act of Mr Vesey Fitzgerald. When the peace of Europe enables foreign countries to manufacture cotton, in place of making war; and when the young men who would formerly have bled as conscripts in Russia and Spain, are now weaving cloth at Sedan, dyeing silk at Lyons, or forging iron at Charenton,—all this is said to be the effects of free trade. When the increased productiveness of our new colonies, the extension of cultivation in the colonies of other nations, and the surprising improvement in European sugar, diminish the value of Jamaica estates and mortgages, this is complained of as the results of the new system. The absurdity of these fallacies is so gross, as to be perceptible, even to those who utter them. But a more serious charge is yet to be made. At a time of extreme pressure, excitement, and privation, the ultra tory writers and orators adopt the very course so vehemently censured by themselves, when pursued by the radicals, their ancient opponents, but present models. The vicissitudes of trade, each depression of the market, every bankruptcy at New York, or failure of the wheat crop at the Cape of Good Hope, is imputed to parliament, and to the ministers of the crown:

——— our lives, our souls,  
 Our debts, our careful wives, our children,  
 Our sins, lay all upon the King! He must bear all.  
 O hard condition!

If the state of manufactures, or the interest of the party, render a fall of wages necessary, there have been cases, in which masters and employers have referred their discontented workmen to the Board of Trade and to the House of Commons, as responsible for the reduction. The resignation of a cabinet minister was

made the occasion of an attempt to exasperate every lighterman and ship-wright on the Thames into fierce and personal hostility; and the manufacturers of Spitalfields were induced to waste on empty and ridiculous processions, time and money, which, if better employed, might have contributed to the alleviation of their distress. As instances of the inflammatory and factious language now unhesitatingly employed, we shall not quote mechanics from Barnsley, or orators from Spitalfields. Men of that description are entitled, at a time of distress, to much consideration and indulgence. But no such concessions can be claimed on behalf of grave and reverend personages, of mature years, who assume the functions of legislators, and aspire to the characters of statesmen. Where can we find language more mischievous than what has been addressed to the ship-owners of Whitby, by the Coryphæus of anti-commercial principles, Mr Sadler? Having kindly endeavoured to demonstrate the total ruin of his audience, he proceeded to notice, as the first cause of the evil, the alterations on the Navigation Act. 'That Act,' he observed, 'formed part of the naval constitution of England; it was on the faith of that sacred engagement, for sacred it had become in the sight of successive generations of Englishmen, that you, gentlemen of Whitby, embarked your property, which is now much of it sacrificed and lost, by *as direct an act of spoliation as if the same power had seized a portion of your estates.*' When sentiments like these are expressed under such circumstances, the doubt suggested is not so much, whether the speaker is of sane mind, as whether he is entitled to be considered a good subject and an upright man. The innkeepers on the Dover road excited the laughter of the public, when they petitioned Parliament against the Ostend and Calais steam-packets; but, when the apostles of the new school stigmatize competition as robbery and spoliation, we cannot help feeling emotions stronger than surprise or contempt.

Let us divest the opinions of these men of the jargon with which they confound their readers, and confuse their arguments; and we shall then be enabled to judge how far such principles can be acceptable to reasonable and well-judging persons. If translated into plain English, however pertinacious Justice Shallow and the Rector of Tything cum Boreham may continue, we doubt not that the manufacturers and traders will reject the offers of protection made by their injudicious friends. To the shipowners, the Sadlerian school first addresses itself. Even these philosophers can scarcely deny, that without commerce it would be vain to talk of navigation. Yet they would persuade the public, that at a period of general pressure, high freights

would contribute to the prosperity of our merchants, and to the extension of their sales. They would carry on the trade in French apples, Dutch cheese, and Flemish eggs, in vessels built and navigated as if they were intended to cross the Atlantic, or to double Cape Horn. The intelligent shipowner will rejoice to find, that in the partition of trade, which is the inevitable consequence of a state of peace, England still retains the lion's share; whilst for a fine weather and cross channel trade, our neighbours (to use a mariner's phrase,) can put to sea in a hen-coop, the superiority of our ships and crews secures a preference for British bottoms where dangers are to be run, and risks surmounted. A man of plain sense, in place of answering Mr Sadler, would have pointed to the East Indiaman lying on the stocks, below his window; and though the vessel, a free trader, had the honour of bearing the name of the Earl of Eldon, and though a formidable likeness of the learned lord was fixed on its prow, judgment must have been given against the itinerant orator, without hesitation or delay. So long as the numbers of British vessels continue to increase, it is but silly sophistry to suggest the decline of our shipping interest; and the ship-owners themselves know full well, that their ruin would be consequent upon any additional burdens cast on our commerce.

To the wool-growers, Mr Sadler and his friends address themselves with peculiar emphasis, and assure them, that all their distress is attributable to foreign importations. Petitions are prepared and presented. All that is unfavourable to their theory is suppressed. The effects of home-speculation, keeping back the growth of several years, in expectation of the increase of price the operation tended to prevent,—the value of the carcass, which affords some compensation for the depreciation of the fleece,—the progress of luxury, making a superfine coat as necessary to the artisan as it was formerly to a lord of the bedchamber;—all these facts are kept out of view. It is said that Mr Canning met one of the late Lord Sheffield's innumerable pamphlets, in the library of some country friend. The tract is stated to have begun with a sentence like the following: 'There can be no doubt that under a due system of protection, the growth of British wools might be greatly increased, and that our domestic wools might eventually be enabled to stand the competition of the wools of the continent.' The day being gloomy, and the society not brilliant, the witty statesman changed every W into an F, and in this new shape he left the essay for the amusement and instruction of the neighbourhood. If we possessed this literary curiosity, we should republish it at our own expense, or recommend it to be subjoined as an appendix to some Parlia-

mentary Report. At low prices, say the wool-growers, they cannot effect a sale; 'raise the prices artificially,' reasons Mr Sadler, 'and you will command the market.' This may be taken as a fair specimen of the arguments with which one portion of the community is amused, and another deluded.

The leading principle of the new school is a denial of the benefits of cheapness. They maintain that it may be wise and expedient to pay dear for a bad article, whilst a good one may be procured at a lesser cost. If for dear and cheap, we substitute the almost convertible terms scarce and abundant, the pestilent nature of this heresy is manifest. But it is contended, that corn is of all commodities that which it is expedient to procure at a price artificially high. In other words, not only the landlord, whose rents rise with the price of wheat, but the manufacturer, the labourer and artisan who eats the quartern loaf without receiving rents, all have precisely the same interest. 'The country prospered,' it is said, 'when the quartern of wheat sold for 120 shillings;' therefore, it prospered in consequence of 'that price;' and to restore such blessed times the legislature is exhorted to use its most strenuous exertions! Were the whole community producers and sellers of corn, the argument might possibly be entertained; but when the numbers who grow corn are compared with those who eat bread, the sophistry becomes apparent. One class of the community, that of the tenants and farmers, have been caught by the notion, that high prices are beneficial to their interests. The delusion is, however, disappearing. Rents may and must be affected; and where permanent contracts have been entered into, the rise of corn may improve the condition of the tenant. Such cases are, however, of rare occurrence, and in all the ordinary transactions between landlord and tenant, the latter will find his advantage in the large loaf.

Whilst the community are exhorted to secure for themselves and their children the advantages of a higher price for bread;—or, in other words, to secure to their families all the blessings of scarcity,—every attempt to reduce local or national burdens is considered not only ineffectual, but criminal. A whisper against high rents, is construed an attack on the landed aristocracy. An endeavour to correct the vicious principle of the poor-laws, is stigmatized as inhuman. To withdraw the encouragements which produce a redundant population, is to counteract the dispensations of Providence. To settle paupers in comfort in Canada, is to become the ministers of banishment and death. To call for a reduction in the malt or leather duties, is rank jacobinism. To amend the licensing system, which restricts our

peasantry to a liquor aptly called by Mr Brougham, 'Justice's juice,' is to calumniate the unpaid magistracy. 'An inundation' of Polish oats (as it was termed by Sir Thomas Lethbridge,) is as much feared as a general deluge; and Messrs O'Connell and Shiel are scarcely considered more dangerous than the transubstantiated wheat, and Irish hogs, landed weekly on the quays of Bristol and Liverpool.

When the new philosophers are driven to own, that their principles, even if practicable at home, would necessarily exclude British enterprise from all foreign markets, they assure us, that such a result is not to be deprecated; that home demand is the one thing needful; that a bold peasantry, and an independent gentry, are the real bulwarks of the state; and that if our justices are reduced to the toast and ale of their forefathers, and their daughters to the grograms and russets of early times, all will be well. We doubt whether such a change would have been acceptable to Sir Roger de Coverley himself. By Will Honeycomb, it never would have been tolerated; and as for that philosopher and theorist, Sir John Falstaff, he was too fond of sack, and of the drapery of flame-coloured taffeta, to have sacrificed the foreign trade of England. Had these literary patriots consented to the change, our reformers would find further persuasion necessary, before the Patronesses of Almacks would agree to recline on rushes, in the costume of Elizabeth's maids of honour, as described by Sir John Harrington.

It has often been said, that all men are ready to apply a levelling principle to their superiors, maintaining with German precision the subordination of those below them. It is thus with many of the disciples of the new school, who, whilst their leaders lay down universal principles, claim each in turn so many exceptions, that the rule ceases to exist. All purchasers seek unlimited freedom, and all sellers unlimited protection. Dear sales, and cheap purchases, are required from Parliament; but, as the entire community makes these very moderate and very consistent demands, it requires the ingenuity as well as the omnipotence of Parliament, to discover means of gratifying the petitioners. As all parties admit the benefits of free trade, except where they are interested in producing high prices, the truth and wisdom of the system may be considered as demonstrated. The pre-eminence of the great soldier of antiquity was proved, not by the readiness with which his countrymen voted him the first place in honour, but by the unanimity with which he was given the second place, by the Athenian citizens, each of whom reserved the highest distinction for himself. The throwster approves of a repeal of all duties on raw silk, but would

prohibit foreign organzine. The Coventry weaver claims foreign thrown silk, free from duty, but demands protection against his Lyonesse competitor. The love of our nobility and gentry for cheap foreign luxuries, is equal to their antipathy to cheap foreign corn. They would favour French wines, but prohibit Dantzic wheat. The planters consider a bounty of L.1,200,000 all too little for England to pay, to promote the growth of sugar and the continuance of slavery; but name the lumber trade, and the colonist quotes Adam Smith, and M'Culloch, and becomes a philosopher. Let us calmly ask, what conclusion a rational enquirer is to draw from these facts? Ought he not to reject the testimony of all who appear in defence of selfish interests? Let an agriculturist be challenged on the *voir dire* when he defends the corn laws, and an East India director when he praises the China monopoly. Each may be heard fairly and candidly as an advocate, but rejected as an incompetent witness, and a partial if not a corrupt judge.

The opinions of the Sadlerian school are scarcely more untenable than their mode of reasoning is inconclusive. When we defend the freedom of trade in the abstract, we are attacked as theorists and visionaries.—‘General principles,’ observed a late Member of Parliament, ‘General principles will be the destruction of England.’ Not only are authors and philosophic reasoners disregarded by those who call themselves exclusively the practical men, but if one of their own class touch the dangerous implements of pen and ink, except to indorse a bill, or post an account, he, too, is proscribed, and stigmatised as a traitor and a renegade. Contrary to medical analogy, the merchant and manufacturer to whom the infection of Political Economy is communicated by inoculation, is in still greater danger than the writer who takes the disease in the natural way. Hence, Mr Baring, Mr Powlett Thompson, and Mr Warburton, are considered totally ignorant of trade, Mr Ricardo of finance, and Mr Mushet of coin and currency. Yet having thus *tabooed* all theories and theorists, when these gentlemen are answered by official accounts and returns—when their opponent is no longer Hume the philosopher, but Mr Hume of the Custom-house, their indignation is still greater. They deny the accuracy of the very papers they have called for; they suggest fraud in the officers who prepare, and the government who produce them. Time and figures, over which the gods themselves were not considered to have any power, appear to Mr Sadler but as toils set for his innocence and credulity. He professes his ignorance of the mode in which public documents are ‘managed’ or ‘made up.’ The enemies of theory, when contradicted by facts, are them-



selves driven back upon theory, and end as they began, by an appeal to the wisdom of our ancestors, and the principles of the commercial constitution. They appeal also to their own experiences, like the Methodists; and endeavour, from a few instances of doubtful authority, to draw a general conclusion. They produce their brick, and they pass sentence on the building. Vanquished both on theoretical and practical grounds, to these gentlemen, who protest against both modes of reasoning, we may apply the words of the Irish drummer, at a military execution—‘Flog them high, or flog them low, there is no pleasing them.’

Again, when Mr Malthus, in his invaluable work, announces that population and food *have a tendency* to increase severally in geometrical and in arithmetical progression, an outcry is raised not only against the proposition itself, but against what is termed the affected pedantry of the expression. But when the oracle of the school enunciates that ‘the fecundity of human beings, under equal circumstances, varies inversely as their numbers on a given space,’ the statement, however absurd, is cited by the votaries of the shrine as the most profound discovery of modern science, and the most precise and forcible of all philosophical definitions.

It does not at the first appear very evident whence can proceed the desire of the old Tory party to raise a cry against freedom of trade. It may perhaps be, from discovering an analogy between commercial liberty and the other subjects of their aversion;—it may be, because the same party have opposed all measures promoting civil and religious liberty, free enquiry, liberal education, and a generous foreign policy;—it may be, because the same party have supported all prohibitions and restrictions,—the game laws, the slave trade, slavery itself, and all restraints and fetters on the press. A foreigner describes the general alarm that prevails in England against a common enemy,—‘the Catch Cold,’—and Goldsmith, the agitation of all London and Westminster at the cry of ‘Mad Dog.’ In these cases the alarmists had some foundation to build on; but we are ready to stake Malthus against Sadler, (more fearful odds than any offered at Tattersal’s,) that all the efforts of party will never produce one placard in favour of high prices or dear bread. We do not mean to deny that our opponents reason fairly, in thus connecting commercial and political liberty. Without the latter, the advantages of the former can never be fully experienced; and freedom of trade, developing industry, producing wealth, and promoting independence, necessarily leads to political liberty. M. Pecchio is consequently right, and does not wander into declamation when he opens his work with the following very elo-

quent passage :—‘ La libertà non è un nome vuoto, non è un ente immaginario, ma una reale e potente benefattrice de’ popoli. Essa opera i suoi prodigi col centuplicar le forze della mente e del cuore, mediante l’emulazione che risveglia, colla sicurezza che offre alla proprietà e alle persone senza di cui non vi può essere ne industria ne commercio; infine colla convergenza di tutti i pensieri e di tutti gli interessi verso il bene comune. Mentre il filosofo isolato nel suo gabinetto stenta a ritrovare il punto in cui si riuniscono tutti gl’interessi personali, la libertà lo ritrova immantinente. Un popolo senza libertà è simile a un sordo e muto; vi vuole un miracolo della scienza per indovinare le sue malattie o i suoi bisogni. Il popolo libero ascolta chiunque vuole istruirlo, ed a vicenda parla, illumina e dirige, il proprio legislatore.’—P. 14.

We hope that the preceding observations may not be so far misunderstood as to be considered a denial of the distress now existing; or, still less, as betraying any indifference to the sufferings of any portion of our countrymen. That distress we admit, and we deeply deplore. But we still contend, that those distresses, so far from being produced, have been mitigated, by the new system. The effect of a cessation of a war demand, and of a war monopoly of commerce, acts directly on many important interests. During the late war, annual millions were taken off in loans, which, in many cases, produced an increased and artificial demand for our manufactures. In the present times, on the contrary, this accumulation is vested in manufactures and industry; and in place of creating, as formerly, a new demand, it now augments the supply. Let it be supposed, for illustration, that during any year of the war, a loan of L.2,000,000 was subscribed, and expended in scarlet cloth and arms: at Birmingham and Stroud, an immediate stimulus was given to the manufactures of both places, and prices rose. In peace, no loans being raised, the L.2,000,000 remain in the pockets of individuals, and are by them applied in increased production. According to our first illustration, a new demand is created, and, by our second, an additional supply is poured into the market. Prices will have a tendency to fall, profits to be diminished, and manufacturing distress will ensue. The effects of machinery, at a period of falling prices, are also most remarkable and important. In a simple state of society, a cessation, or diminution of demand, soon produces a corresponding influence on production, till prices are re-adjusted. If he cannot sell his web, the cottage weaver becomes an agriculturist; if wheat falls, and house property augments in value, the farming labourer becomes an attendant on the bricklayer or stone-ma-

son. But an iron-forge, or a power-loom factory, cannot be diverted from its original destination; and its proprietors continue to work it, even in the face of a falling market, and of reduced profits, in order to secure some interest, however small, on their fixed capital. The extreme delicacy of some of the machinery, used in manufactures, renders it necessary that work should be continued even without profit, lest the machinery should perish by being left inactive. The rapid improvements in machinery, though increasing the sum of national wealth, produce for a time great pressure on individuals. An enterprising merchant may, in 1829, have invested his disposable capital in machinery, which in 1830 becomes valueless by the competition of an improved invention. It is thus that the linen-weavers and hand-spinners in Ireland are giving way to the manufacturers of Yorkshire and Scotland; and the effects of the improved machinery of Leeds and Huddersfield are felt in Wilts and Gloucestershire. The increased production, all over the world, is however the principal cause of the fall of price. If the banks of the Mississippi, and the Mauritius, double and triple the supplies of sugar, how is it possible that high prices should continue for the benefit of our West India planters? The subject of currency is too large and too important to be touched upon incidentally; but we may be allowed to remark, that the suppression of small notes, for which the political economists are held responsible, so far from being founded on the principles of free trade, is in opposition to them. Were the business of banking freed from monopolies, so far from requiring a prohibition of any particular species of currency, the abstract principles of free trade would allow the banker and the public to decide what denomination of note would contribute to their mutual interest and security. Convertibility, and a full disclosure of banking accounts, would then be relied upon as a sufficient protection.

In thus recapitulating, briefly, the principal causes which produce the existing distress, it has been our object to prove, that, whether they are artificial or natural, permanent or transitory, so far from being the results of free trade, they arise, at least in part, from the want of it. If French wine is so abundant as to be poured out in the streets, to avoid the payment of duty—if British iron is unsaleable, it is clear that a mutual exchange would be a mutual benefit. If Poland requires our cottons, and our manufacturers require cheap bread, is it not evident that a more liberal system of intercourse would improve the clothing and food of the inhabitants of Dantzic and of Manchester? The artificial high price of any commodity, which is not only the effect, but the object, of all commercial restrictions, leaves a small-

er amount to be expended in other articles. The high price of corn reacts in this way, against the very interest of the agriculturist. ‘Quiconque aura dépensé dix écus de plus en pain de-  
 ‘pensera dix écus de moins en viande, en bière, et sans calcu-  
 ‘ler que le boucher et le brasseur eux mêmes sont obligés de con-  
 ‘sommer moins, que d’autres souffrent de leurs épargnes, et sont  
 ‘par consequence obligés de restreindre leur dépense.’—(Schmalz, *Econ. Pol.*)

We would fain address one word more to the ultra politicians, and warn them against indulging hopes which can never be realised. Were they in full possession of the Cabinet, and did Mr Sadler himself preside over the Board of Trade, they would still find their own system wholly impracticable. They might, indeed, endeavour to reverse what they term, ‘the most cruel  
 ‘policy that ever was ventured upon by any government, to say  
 ‘nothing of its folly.’—(Sadler’s *Speech*.) They might condemn all freedom of intercourse, and commercial reciprocity, ‘as the  
 ‘most disheartening and prejudicial of all systems.’ They might term the opinions of Mr Malthus, ‘a diabolical doctrine,  
 ‘beginning by affronting God, and ending in injuring man; lead-  
 ‘ing, if it were true, to short and infernal remedies.’—(Sadler’s *Speech*.) All this, they might repeat with authority; but maintain their principles of prohibition, never. Under their system, Captain Johnson, the smuggler, would be more than a match even for a minister as powerful as Mr Pitt. The Deal boatmen would defeat the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as certainly as the respectable gentlemen of ‘another religion’ overreach the first Lord of the Treasury in dealing for annuities on the Stock Exchange. The smuggler may be considered as the antagonist muscle, or the balance weight to all the authorities of Downing Street; and he interposes effectually, to remedy the injustice of the law, to check financial rapacity, and to punish official blunders and selfishness. Filangieri, in his remarks upon the ancient commercial system of England, makes the following rational observations:—‘Si crede comunemente che i dazi  
 ‘imposti sull’ estrazione delle mercanzie nazionali, sieno un  
 ‘male, ma che quegli imposti sulla immissione delle straniere  
 ‘sieno un bene per lo stato. Il governo Britannico che ha  
 ‘sempre cercato l’ estrazione delle mercanzie nazionali, ha esor-  
 ‘bitantemente caricato di dazi l’ immissione delle straniere.  
 ‘Qual’ è stato l’ effetto di questo erroneo sistema? 1° La  
 ‘moltiplicità de’ contrabbandi, che le pene le più severe non  
 ‘possono impedire, allorchè sono uniti ad un gran beneficio.  
 ‘2° La diminuzione del suo commercio di economia.’ These doctrines would make their impression. Ultra ministers would,

like Galen, be converted by their own dissections: we protest, however, against allowing the people of England to be anatomised by them. They would be compelled to embrace the principles of their opponents, and would bless those whom they had been called to curse. Narrow and selfish views of private interest cannot, we are confident, be long maintained, even by the Ultras themselves, but must yield to the more generous principles of an enlarged and enlightened policy. ‘Omnino qui reipublicæ præfecturi sunt duo præcepta teneant. Unum ut utilitatem civium sic tueantur, ut quæcunque agunt ad eam referent, oblitī commodorum suorum: alterum ut totum corpus reipublicæ curent, ne dum partem aliquam tueantur reliquas deserent.’

Not, however, wishing to purchase the improvement of our old Tory friends at the extravagant price of their restoration to political power, as a safer remedy, we take the liberty of recommending to their attentive perusal the works on Political Economy, which issue from the continental press. They may, perhaps, be disposed to treat with candour the writings of men unconnected with the party divisions of England. M. Schmalz may be attended to by those who hear Mr Huskisson with distrust. M. Say may be preferred to Mr Ricardo, and Ortes and Ricci may give some additional support for Mr Malthus. ‘Si sa,’ observes M. Pecchio, ‘quanto le opinioni del Sig. Malthus sieno stati combattute. Quale però sarebbe la sorpresa de suoi oppositori in Inghilterra se sapessero che Ortes alla scorta delle stesse osservazioni è giunto agli stessi risultati del loro concittadino. E meravigliosa la coincidenza delle opinioni di questi due autori. Nati in differenti regioni, di religione diversa, a una distanza di tempo di trent’anni uno dall’altro (senza che l’Inglese avesse neppure inteso il nome dell’Italiano,) cavarrono le stesse conseguenze.’

If our opponents commence the course of study we suggest, we recommend to their attention the treatise of M. Pecchio on the Political Economists of Italy. We cannot expect them to undertake the perusal of the fifty volumes, of which the Essay before us contains a brilliant and masterly abstract.\* We cannot

---

\* *Raccolta degli Economisti Classici Italiani*, 50 tom. 8vo, Milano, 1813-16. This publication is, in every respect, highly creditable to Italy. For such a collection there is, unhappily, in our own country, no sort of encouragement; or rather, to speak in the language of the present subject, the cost of production would raise the remunerating price so high as totally to extinguish demand. Yet, it does appear to us, that a well-chosen selection of our earlier writers on Trade and Money,—the real

expect them to trace the progress of the science from the writings of Sciaruffi in 1582 to the present time. But a sensible and well-written volume of three hundred pages is not so formidable a task. M. Pecchio, known to the literary world by former publications, and distinguished by his sufferings, as well as his zeal in the cause of liberty, has performed a most useful service by the publication of this Essay. He gives an agreeable and distinct account of the Political Economists of Italy, and of their writings; and prefixes to it an admirable historical sketch of the condition of the Italian states, more particularly in relation to their commerce and their finances. The extent to which the science of public economy has been carried during the last two hundred and fifty years in Italy, and the variety of subjects investigated, may perhaps excite some surprise. The list of authors comprehends the distinguished names of Davanzati, Galiani, Genovesi, Algarotti, Beccaria, Verri, Ricci, and Filangieri; men not only distinguished for genius and learning, but as practical statesmen and politicians. In some states, that of Tuscany in particular, the influence of these productions has been felt strongly, and most usefully, and 'gli effetti d'un buon libro sotto un buon principe,' have shown themselves in the improvement of the commercial system. Political Economy became a favourite pursuit; and Parini, in his satires, notices the affectation of knowledge in this science as one of the fashionable follies of the day:—

' Commercio alto gridar, gridar commercio  
 All' altro lato della mensa or odi  
 Con fanatica voce, e tra il fragore  
 D'un peregrino d' eloquenza fiume,  
 Di bella novità stampata al conio  
 Le forme apprendi, onde assai meglio puoi  
 Brillantati pensier picchin la mente  
 Tu pur grida commercio, e la tua Dama  
 Anco un motto ne dica.'—

If the necessary limits of this article did not preclude such an enquiry, we should willingly accompany M. Pecchio in his history of Italian commerce. The subject is one of great interest. The prosperity of Venice, Genoa, Florence, and Milan—the trade carried on by Amalfi, even before the crusades—the conquests and the colonies of the Latins in the Levant—Scio, Mitylene,

---

founders of the science of Political Economy, limited to a few volumes, and in which each Piece should be accompanied with an introductory notice, illustrative of its scope and merits, would prove an acceptable and saleable publication.

Pera, and Constantinople—Tuscany, when her citizens had established banks and factories all over Europe; when her rich traders, the Bardi and Odoardi, had furnished immense loans to our Plantagenet princes—the eighty banks, and two hundred woollen manufactories of Florence—the hundred mints, providing coin for the countries bounding the Mediterranean—the public debt established at Venice in 1170, and the consequent introduction of a bank of deposit, and of paper money to pay the interest of loans—the origin at Genoa of joint-stock companies formed by subscription—universities endowed with professorships, and frequented by students from all parts of Europe—these are all subjects worthy of minute enquiry, comprehending as they do some of the most important events in modern history, as well as discoveries in commerce and finance. The prosperity of Italy may be traced almost exclusively to her early free institutions; ‘*La libertà la rese industriosa, l’industria opulente, e l’opulenza illustre.*’ Her decline and fall is attributable not so much to the altered course of trade, as to the oppression, the pillage, and military exactions of the Austrians, and other invaders. Of all her spoilers, from the incursions of the barbarians downwards, the Austrians have been the most fatal and destructive; and yet the sack of Genoa and Rome, the Constable of Bourbon, Mendoza, and Melagnano, were not so injurious to the interests of Italy, as was the creation of a venal, proud, and indolent aristocracy, from whence were taken

di rè cattivo consiglier’ peggiori.

From the time of the treaty of Aix la Chapelle, the condition of Italy has gradually improved. More attention has been paid to her commercial interests—more enlightened men have been called to the councils of sovereigns. The character of the Austrian princes who have ruled at Florence, their wisdom and liberality, the mildness of their system of administration, their salutary reforms, have not only contributed to the happiness of Tuscany, but have promoted the improvement of other states. Whilst M. Pecchio is alive to all the former triumphs of Italy, he exhibits the rare instance of a mind not dazzled by the brilliancy of the arts and literature of his country, but capable of distinguishing accurately between the glories of Leo X., and the more solid elements of national prosperity. ‘*Mentre Leon X., onorava le lettere e le belle arti, l’agricoltura le manifatture e il commercio andavano mancando ne’ suoi stati. Ferrara, Urbino, Rimini, che, se non sotto le ali della libertà, avevano fiorito, tramontarono. Il secol di Leon X., fu simile ad un’ aurora boreale che splende e illumina dei deserti di ghiaccio. La felicità de’ popoli*

'non consiste in quadri ed in poemi, ma in 'un ben essere universale e in una libertà di pensieri ed azioni convenienti ai destini dell' uomo.'

The subjects which have occupied the attention of the Political Economists of Italy, are precisely the same which, in our own country, have led to the most extensive and laborious discussions. Currency, Corn Laws, Protecting Duties, the Measure of Value, the Usury Law, the doctrines of Population, a Provision for the Poor, Saving Banks, Emigration, have been all considered; and a perusal of M. Pecchio's book might remove the apprehensions of many of the 'timid elderly gentlemen,' who, in the spring of the year make long speeches, and advertise for 'strong and quiet ponies,' and who consider certain measures as proceeding from a knot of conspiring capitalists and philosophers, sworn to extirpate that race which produces county members and chairmen of quarter sessions. We shall transcribe some few observations of the Italian authors, with a view to create a desire in the minds of our readers to pursue the subject further.

At a period when the 'morbus numericus' raged like a pestilence, and when kings and republics were justly termed 'falsarj pubblici,' the first work on currency appeared. It has been well said, that the reign of Charles II. was the era of good laws and of bad government; and M. Ganilh observes, that 'Italy was long remarkable for the worst coin, and the best books upon money.' The earliest work of Scaruffi, contains the enlarged proposition of one general mint for all Europe; thus establishing an indentivity of coin throughout the eastern hemisphere. In arguing against any depreciation of standard, this early writer exhibits a strictness of principle, not unimportant to many politicians of later times; though too complimentary to the reigning princes of the sixteenth century, to whom it was addressed. Recommending a general law for the restoration of a fixed standard, he proceeds:—'Senza nessun dubbion non vi sarà persona pubblica ò privata che non acceti volentieri questi nuove, veri, reali, e così utili ordini; conoscendosi che le cose delle monete sono per andare di male in peggio, ed anco perchè ciascuno desidera assequire con effetto nelle monete d'oro e d'argento la giusta quantità in peso del puro e del fino che sia l'intero e real pagamento del suo credito; ed è mente dei rè, principie signori che da ciascuno sia ricevuto ne' pagamenti tutto quello che di ragione e veramente aver si debba.' Montenari points out the disadvantages of mint regulations, which cast the entire expence of the coinage on the government. This subject deserves attention, more particularly at a time, when the separa-



tion of silver from gold has been effected by sulphuric acid on such cheap terms in France, and when the exportation, melting, and return of our coin have been practised at periods when the state of the exchange would not in itself have induced such a proceeding. Pagnini, in his treatise on Prices, points out the important fact so often disregarded, that coin, so far from being fixed in value, is subject to variations like all other commodities. 'La moneta è soggetta alle stesse leggi del prezzo a cui soggette sono le altre cose. Il suo valore è indipendente dall' arbitrio delli nomini. La fatica, per produrla, la quantità, la domanda e l'offerta sono gli elementi del suo prezzo. E dunque ridicolo, per non dir di più, quella tirannia che alcuni principi, e alcuni governi hanno preteso di esercitare sulla moneta; mania simile a quella di coloro che pretendono dominare sulla coscienza o sul pensiero; cose più potente di loro.' It was stated by the late Lord Liverpool, with all the pomp and emphasis of a modern discovery, that not only the amount of the circulating medium should be considered, but the velocity of its circulation. We believe that the first, and certainly the most brilliant enunciation of this truth, is to be found in the *Discorsi* of Bandini—' Succede dell' oro nel commercio come di una fiaccola in mano di un fanciullo che faccia un cerchio continuato di fuoco se venga raggirato con velocità. Con una piccola somma che si raggiri velocemente da una mano in un' altra, abbaglia l'occhio, e par che multiplichi se medesima. Perché un solo scudo che passa da una in altre mani cento volte in un mese, mantenendo egualmente il commercio con diversi scudi che non facessero in questo tempo altro che un solo passeggio nella seconda mano, farà figura di cento scudi provvedendo ciascheduna di queste cento persone che lo spesero del loro bisogno per l'intero valore di uno scudo.' The bearings of these observations on all comparisons between a gold and paper circulation, as well as upon commercial transactions generally, are as obvious as they are important. Our clearing-house in London, our exchange of notes, and settlement of balances in Scotland, remittances by post-bills, and inland bills of exchange, have given such a velocity to our circulation as to render the actual amount by no means the measure of its efficiency; one million in 1830 performing most probably the functions of a million and a half fifty years back.

On the Corn question Galiani observes with truth, that ' dans tout gouvernement la législation des blés prend le ton de l'esprit du gouvernement.' How truly is this exemplified in the proceedings of our legislature, in which the agricultural commoners are powerful, and the agriculturist peers are irresistible.

The time may not, however, be distant, when both classes may be induced, or compelled, to admit with Verri, that '*la libertà è il miglior rimedio contro gli sbalzi del prezzo, e contro la fame.*'

Mr Bentham, in one of his best and earliest works, that upon Usury, has not stated his argument more ably than the economists of Naples and Piedmont,—Galiani and Vasco. The reasoning of the latter is so close, and is carried on with such a mathematical rigour of proof, as to claim the peculiar attention of those who feel apprehensive that a free trade in money would lead to the foreclosure of all mortgages, rather than to a fall in the interest of money. 'I. L'uso del denaro ha nel comun commercio un prezzo come ogni altra cosa venale;—II. Il prezzo d'ogni cosa venale non è arbitrario ma determinato del confronto del bisogno de' ricercatori con quello degli esibitori;—III. Da questo confronto adunque sarà anche determinato il prezzo dell'uso del medesimo, ossia l'usura;—IV. Quanto più libera sarà la contrattazione de' mutui, tanto sarà maggiore il numero, e più cospicua la premura delle esibizioni;—V. Dunque quanto saranno i contratti de' mutui più liberi tanto minore sarà l'usura.'

We are reluctantly compelled to omit any notice of the remarks of Ricci on Population and the Poor Laws, and shall conclude this article by a few words in reply to the parallel drawn by M. Pecchio, between the Political Economists of England and of Italy. The author does not exhibit, in this part of his work, his usual acuteness and candour. He contends that the attention of our writers is directed rather to the wealth than to the happiness of nations. He imputes to them a deficiency in those enlarged and philosophic views, which embrace higher objects than the increase of production and of consumption. He objects to the want of profound political disquisitions, moral precepts, or historical deductions. Now, with the utmost respect for Mr Pecchio, we conceive that our countrymen have judged rightly in separating subjects in themselves distinct; subjects to be discussed in a different manner, and on different principles. Our writers take much for granted, that an Italian economist is called upon to demonstrate;—the benefits of freedom; the good consequences of a representative government, and of unshackled discussion; the advantages of moral education, and of the diffusion of knowledge; the necessity of a cheap and simple administration of justice;—all these are assumed by our writers as admitted truths, and are not made the basis of a treatise on currency, or of the corn laws. What M. Pecchio calls the Philosophy of Political Economy, may be bought too dearly at the expense of exact-

ness and precision. It is said that some ancient author, in describing the qualifications of an architect, recommends that, in the first place, he should be a good lawyer, in order to decide on the title of the lands, on which he proposes to build. On the same principle, some of the Italian economists carry us back from Adam Smith to his first namesake; acting somewhat too literally on the advice of the Comte A. Hamilton, to begin by the beginning. Mariana opens his history, by informing his readers of the arrival in Spain of Tubal, the son of Japhet, the first settler: 'Asi lo sienten y testifican autores muy graves;' and Lope de Vega states, in one of his sonnets, that no Spaniard is satisfied unless a drama is brought down, from the creation, to the day of judgment. It is thus with the Italian economists. Indeed M. Pecchio himself admits this as the besetting sin of his countrymen: 'Sono rimontati alla creazione del mondo per parlare di monete hanno accatastato erudizione ad erudizione citando Ebrei, i Persi ed Assiri, Greci e Romani, Salomone, Platone, Cicerone, et Bacone. Altri declamano come predicatori dal pulpito. Con questo difetto le opere crescono di volume, la verità si annega in un mare di parole, il linguaggio rimane vago e indefinito; e la deficienza nelle idee generali e nelle definizioni protrae e lascia oscure le questioni.'

We do not mean to restrict the political economist to the mere consideration of dry statistical tables, finance accounts, or custom-house returns. We admit that he may incidentally refer to all the most enlarged and general principles; and that he ought always to bring his reasoning to a moral and a political test. These considerations must ever be auxiliary to sound and just reasoning in his peculiar science. But even when confined within narrower bounds, he may still rest satisfied, that if he discovers, promulgates, and defends truth, he cannot fail to promote the cause of human virtue and happiness. Deeply impressed with the importance of his duties, conscious of the influence which the subject of his studies exercises on the interests of society, he is bound to lay down principles and collect facts with a conscientious precision, to reason with a careful exactness, and to avoid all that savours of intolerance and dogmatism. We cannot find a more beautiful and eloquent description of his functions and duties than that of Filangieri,

'Who was himself the great sublime he taught.'

If the modern political economist cannot hope to fill up the masterly outline so powerfully traced, he should, at least, fix his mind upon it as a model of excellence, worthy of his approval and imitation. 'Il filosofo deve essere l'apostolo della verità e

‘ non l’inventore de’ sistemi. Finchè i mali che opprimono l’umanità non saranno guariti; finchè gli errori, ed i pregiudizi, che li perpetuano, troveranno de’ partigiani; finche la verità conosciuta da pochi uomini privilegiati sarà nascosta alla più gran parte del genere umano; finchè apparirà lontana da’ troni, il dovere del filosofo è di predicarla, di sostenerla, di promuoverla, d’illustrarla. Se ’i lumi ch’egli sparge non sono utili pel suo secolo e per la sua patria lo saranno sicuramente per un altro secolo, e per un altro paese. Cittadino di tutti i luoghi, contemporaneo di tutte le età, l’universo è la sua patria, la terra è la sua scuola, i suoi contemporanei e i suoi posterì, suoi discepoli.”

---

ART. III.—*Journal of a Passage from the Pacific to the Atlantic, crossing the Andes in the Northern Provinces of Peru, and descending the River Marañon, or Amazons.* By HENRY LISTER MAW, Lieut. Royal Navy. 8vo. London: 1829.

MR MAW informs us, that on his return home, some friends advised him to publish his Journal, as containing an account of what they justly considered an arduous and interesting expedition. We approve of this advice, and accede to his claim, that, having composed and published his work without literary experience, or pretensions of any kind, and solely on the ground of having performed a remarkable journey, he shall be exempted from any severe critical ordeal. Although, therefore, the volume might afford room for animadversion, both as to composition, the objects of enquiry, and the judgments pronounced upon the facts reported, such discussions are here abstained from. We content ourselves with making the most of the materials furnished, seemingly with complete good faith; and shall endeavour, by means of them, to give our readers some idea of those immense and unfrequented regions through which he passed.

We find nothing in Mr Maw's details regarding Lima and Truxillo, requiring any particular notice. At the latter place he was joined by an English gentlemen of the name of Hinde, who had been some years in Peru in a mercantile capacity, and who accompanied him during the rest of his journey. From Truxillo they proceeded to Caxamarca, the seat of the regal palace of the Incas, and theatre of the calamitous downfall of their dynasty. Of the palace a few stones only remain. Two speculators lately attempted to drain the hot springs, into which, it is believed,

the golden throne of the Incas was cast in the catastrophe of their empire ; but they sought in vain to reach the bottom of the boiling abyss. Caxamarca is seated high up the Andes, on a pampa, or plain, having an English aspect, and producing very fine wheat, which is here made into excellent bread.

On ascending the second Cordillera of the Andes, the travellers saw many traces of ancient Peruvian cultivation, and the indications of a considerable population, in districts now entirely desolate. This confutes the doctrine of some modern advocates of Spain, that the lot of the Indians was improved, at any rate, not deteriorated, by the subversion of their native empire. That the population has been reduced from ten to two millions, as is here averred, must however be a matter of mere conjecture.

From the summit of the second Cordillera the travellers looked down upon the Marañon. Nothing, Mr Maw conceives, can exceed the grandeur of this scenery, which, however, he does not attempt to describe. The stream, sixty yards wide, was seen rushing from between two lofty mountains, whereon rested a brilliant rainbow, which spanned the abyss.

After being benighted, and forced to *bivouac* in the woods, they crossed the Marañon by a ferry, and proceeded by a laborious ascent to the summit of the third Cordillera, the most elevated ridge in this part of America. It does not, however, rival either the white and awful pinnacles which tower above the plain of Quito, or some others which we shall presently notice. There was no snow ; the vegetation was that of the hilly tracts of England, and the thermometer stood at 50°.

The travellers did not at first descend the Marañon itself, but crossed to the Guallaga, its middle and less ample branch. Their route lay through the Montana,—a rough, broken tract, buried beneath such a wild luxuriance of trees and flowering shrubs, that scarcely a cliff was left uncovered. After severe toil through almost impassable roads, they reached Moyobamba, capital of the Maynas, or district on the Guallaga, considerably more fertile than that watered by the Marañon. Cacao, indigo, Jesuits' bark, grow wild ; sugar and coffee may be raised to the greatest advantage ; cotton is so plentiful as to be used in common bagging, but for which flax might be advantageously raised. A fine white wax is produced by bees that lodge in trees, compared to which the tree-wax, to which so much importance is attached by Estalla, (*Viagero Universal*, vol. xxi.,) is said to be held in little esteem. Gums, barks, balsams, dyes, in great variety, are drawn from the forests ; but these, and generally the other productions, are said to exist in higher perfection on the

banks of the great western stream of the Ucayali, which claims to rank as the primary branch of the Marañon.

From Moyobamba the travellers proceeded along high ridges, inferior, however, to those which bordered the great river, and through which glimpses began to appear of that unbounded plain which reaches across America to the Atlantic. The tracks which led along these successive ranges are described as exceedingly rugged, and as furnished with very slender means for the passage of travellers. In one place, a path was cut through a long barrier of rock, but so economically, that though there was room for a mule, it behoved the rider to throw his legs over the animal's neck, to avoid being crushed between its sides and the rock. The paths through the Montana seemed formed upon the principle of avoiding levels, and not shunning even the most perilous heights. So slender was often the deviation from the perpendicular, as to leave no safe mode of proceeding but by lying flat on the mule's back, trusting completely to his guidance.

Before quitting the Andes, we shall lay before our readers some interesting information respecting another part of this remarkable chain, from a Memoir by M. Humboldt, very recently published.\* This Memoir is founded upon observations communicated to him by our countryman, Mr Pentland, who, being attached to the Peruvian embassy, was impelled by the love of science to solicit a mission into Upper Peru, (which we must now call Bolivia,) a region hitherto very little explored. Here he surveyed the great lake of Titicaca, on whose islands and shores were found remarkable monuments of the ancient Peruvian dynasty. He visited La Paz, Oruro, Potosi, and Chuchisaca, the seat of the Bolivian government. But his most important observations respect the extraordinary height of the Andes in this part of Peru. He measured the two loftiest peaks, Illimani and Sorate, compared with which it appears that Chimborazo itself must hide its diminished head. M. Humboldt warrants Mr Pentland's capacity to make barometrical measurements with accuracy. In this way he determined, at 15,951 and 12,760 feet respectively, the height of two stations; whence, being at a convenient distance from the two peaks, he could carry on trigonometrical measurements with advantage. The result gave,

---

\* *Mémoire sur les Travaux Géographiques et Géognostiques de M. Pentland dans le Pérou Méridional.* Par M. A. De Humboldt. (*Annales des Voyages*) Paris, October, 1829.

for Illimani, 24,350 feet; for Sorate, 25,400;—Chimborazo being only 21,400. Attempts were made to reach the summit of Illimani; but the deep clefts in its great glacier, and a violent storm of snow, rendered these ineffectual.

The physical structure of the whole of this part of America is extremely remarkable, and hitherto almost unobserved. Along the coast there had indeed been seen an immense range rising partly above the line of perpetual snow, and of which Chuquihamba, and the volcanic peak of Gualatieri, are supposed by Mr Pentland to reach the height of 22,000 feet. But he has traced an interior and more easterly chain, not represented in our maps, though considerably loftier, and comprising the two stupendous peaks above named. Between these two ranges intervenes a table land, the most elevated on the globe, except that of Thibet, and which is partly occupied, and its waters drained, by the lake of Titiaca, 13,000 feet above the level of the sea. But while Thibet presents only ranges of wild mountain pasture, covered with herds of sheep, this table land of the west supports cities above the region of the clouds,—villages that would overtop the white pinnacles of the Jungfrau and the Schreckhorn,—inhabited stations as high as the top of Mont Blanc; while its plains are covered with harvests of maize, rye, barley, and even of wheat. The following comprise some of the most remarkable altitudes:—

	Feet.
Arequipa, (city,) . . . . .	7,217
Pati, (post-house,) . . . . .	14,402
Puno, (city), . . . . .	12,832
Titiaca, (lake,) . . . . .	12,760
La Paz, (city,) . . . . .	12,194
Oruro, (city,) . . . . .	12,442
Potosi, (market-place,) . . . . .	13,350
—— (mines,) . . . . .	16,080
Chuchisaca, (city,) . . . . .	9,332
Cochambamba, (city,) . . . . .	8,440
Tacora, (village,) . . . . .	14,275
Ancomarca, (post-house,) . . . . .	15,410
Cottages at the source of the Ancomarca,	15,721

We cannot assent to Mr Pentland's theory, that there is a physical peculiarity in the people of this region, causing them to delight in inhabiting these high plains, and in working mines situated still higher. There is nothing, we should think, at all peculiar in men delighting to inhabit a country where they find subsistence and opulence.

M. Humboldt does not appear to place the same implicit reliance on the celestial observations of Mr Pentland, as on those made with the barometer; yet there seems no doubt that all the leading positions in this territory stand in need of extensive correction. Generally speaking, they appear to be two or three degrees west of their real position; consequently, they are all more distant from the sea, and the whole country more extensive than our maps represent it. This was not necessary to refute an objection started by M. Coquebert de Montbret, that peaks so gigantic should have been seen, as conspicuous landmarks, from the shores of the Pacific. Even according to the present erroneous maps, the distance would be too great, separated as they are by an intermediate range of snow-covered Andes; but Mr Pentland seems to make it very evident, that his two grand peaks must be distant from the coast at least 350 miles,—a distance which no human eye, placed upon the Pacific, could possibly reach.

We now resume the thread of Mr Maw's journey. Laguna, near the junction of the Guallaga and Maranon, forms a sort of rude emporium for this mountain region. It was found crowded with Indians, who had flocked from the woods to celebrate one of the Catholic festivals. These people were scantily dressed in the cloth of the country, having their skins dyed with red, purple, and other brilliant colours. The festival was celebrated chiefly by dancing and drinking. The dance appeared to have a certain dramatic character, representing some story or action, accompanied by music, whose imperfect harmony was drowned by the shouts and discordant cries of the performers. In the centre stood an immense bowl of chicha; a liquor fermented from roots by the elegant process of being chewed in the female mouth.

The infant civilisation of this region appears to have deeply suffered from the neglect which the Missions have experienced under the new government. This seems to have been caused partly by the disturbed state of the country, partly by a fanatical enmity against the Jesuits, whose expulsion from America has been a serious evil to the uncivilized parts of that continent. Of the twenty ecclesiastics who are mentioned (*Viagero Universal*, xxi. 131) to have been settled in the Maynas in 1798,—a great reduction from the time of the Jesuits, the Report given to Mr Maw reduces the present number to ten. They held the Indians in mild, though complete subjection; taught them industry and useful arts; and secured to them a reward for their labours, thus initiating them in the first elements of social life. The provincial governors exercise a power equally authoritative,



but founded on force only, and tending to their own private benefit. The Indians, compelled to labour without any return of kindness or reward, work in a slovenly and careless manner; and a great proportion have deserted the *pueblos*, and buried themselves in the depths of the woods, assembling only when a Priest arrives to celebrate one of the great festivals. Laguna has thus been reduced from 1500 to less than a third of that number.

About a day's sail below Laguna the Gullaga opens into the main branch of the Marañon; and about a hundred and fifty miles lower, there was felt an increase in the depth and force of the current, which announced, even amidst the darkness of the night, the influx of the great tributary of the Ucayali, after a course of upwards of a thousand miles. The Marañon now attains its full magnitude; and its course downwards to the Atlantic forms, perhaps, the grandest river-navigation on the face of the earth. Its direct line comprises twenty-two degrees of longitude, or above sixteen hundred miles, throughout the whole of which it was judged capable of receiving vessels of the greatest size. The region perforated by this inland sea, consists of one immense plain, not encroached on even by a hillock from the bordering Andes, but sloping gradually and almost insensibly down to the Atlantic.

During the voyage, sometimes one, sometimes even both shores were invisible. The channel was filled with islands, usually little more than sand-banks, the largest of which were wooded. The breadth of the stream was indicated by a triple current, that of mid-channel being slower than the two along the banks; the rate varying from three to six miles an hour. These currents were effecting continual changes both in the shore and islands. Portions of the bank would be seen falling in, while the trees with which it was clothed were thrown in masses into the water. Sometimes these trees, having their roots deeply fixed, remained after the surrounding soil had been washed away, and stood like watery groves.

On either bank, the animal and feathered creation, in vast numbers, filled the earth and the air. The shores resounded with the cries of various large birds, among which the moutuns were the most numerous. The coati, with its note resembling a watchman's bell, and heard at several miles distance, took its station on the top of a tree, and amused itself with making the woods ring. The uruba, or crow-vulture, duly attended the travellers' meals, and screamed in despair when it found nothing left. Parrots crowded the villages, joining in the mirth and talk of the Indians; so as often it could not be known by

the ear whether an Indian or a parrot was talking. The chief land-animal was the tiger, of various species and sizes, some very powerful, though not quite matching those of Bengal. The *vacca marina*, a species of the walrus, is the chief inhabitant of the river. It was stated to Mr Maw, that certain lakes connected with the Marañon, were infested with serpents so monstrous and formidable, that neither man, nor animal of any other species, durst approach these waters. Condamine mentions a similar statement as made to him; a coincidence which makes it probable, that these lakes really contain some serpents of extraordinary size.

Tabitinga, situate about the 69th degree of longitude, forms the boundary point between Peru and Brazil. Down to this point, European influence has been on the whole beneficent;—has rendered the Indians more orderly, and more industrious, than the untamed races who lie beyond its reach. On the Portuguese side, a new order of things is exhibited; and the banks of the Marañon, so far as occupied by them, present an aspect of the deepest moral gloom. The basis of the European population was formed by banished felons, reinforced by outlaws,—persons ruined by their vices, and others the refuse of society. They no sooner ascended the Marañon, than they constituted themselves lords over its unbounded wilds. They applied the arts and knowledge of Europe to the purpose of converting the Indians into instruments for the gratification of their avarice. They commenced, with this view, a slave-hunting system, the unre-mitted prosecution of which has nearly expelled the native tribes from the banks of the great river, and left no scope for its continuance, but by ascending the principal tributaries. The king of Portugal, indeed, issued a rescript against enslaving the Indians; but the *brancos* (whites) who occupy this territory, have made it a rule to obey the laws no further than suits their own convenience. They continue, therefore, to *enter*, as they term it, the Yapura, and other great rivers flowing into the Marañon. Forming themselves into parties of seven or eight, they embark, well armed, and attended by some Indian qualified to serve as a guide. Having reached the vicinity of an Indian village, they watch the opportunity of attack, endeavouring to catch a stray individual, whom they compel to guide them to the abode of his tribe. Such terror do the Portuguese inspire, that six or seven of them falling upon a party of a hundred Indians, as they dance round their fires, have only to seize and carry off as many as they can manage; the rest thinking only of escape.

Mr Maw, on Portuguese authority, hesitates not to charge the native tribes of these regions as guilty of cannibalism, on an un-

paralleled scale;—such as to make human flesh be viewed by them as a regular fund of subsistence. We are by no means satisfied with his statements on this subject. His facts, in no case, rest on ocular testimony. A boy was shown, indeed, whose father and mother, it was said, had been eaten; but the mere presence of the boy could not add weight to the assertion. A certain person told him that his father-in-law, after feasting on an Indian mess, had been dismayed by finding a human thumb at the bottom of the dish. It was furthermore stated, that the captives destined for the gratification of royal palates, were kept in large *corrals*, or gardens, which the king every morning entered, and discharged a *poisoned* arrow at the individual whom he wished that day to be served up at table. Nay, the victims themselves, it was said, felt no sort of objection to this treatment; for a girl, whom a trader offered to take out of one of these *corrals*, chose much rather to stay and take her turn of being eaten! Mr Maw endeavours to excuse the natives, by supposing that the Portuguese, having shut them out from the fisheries on the Maranon, had left them only this horrid mode of supporting themselves. He does not reflect that any tribe, making this their staple source of subsistence, would be extinct in a month. We learn from Father D'Acuna, whose account of the river Amazons was originally published in 1641, that he had been entertained with similar stories by the same class of persons; but he ascertained their complete falsehood in regard to the tribe specially pointed at, and arrived finally at the following conclusion: 'The Portuguese publish this, that under pretext of avenging such cruelties, they may commit others that are greater beyond comparison; since, with brutal inhumanity, they dare to make slaves of men born free and independent.'—(Chap. lxii.)

We examined this volume somewhat curiously as to any light it might throw on the romantic story, which has given to the river its most popular appellation of 'The Amazons.' The report seems to have originated with Orellana, the first discoverer of the Maranon, whom D'Acuna hesitates not to charge with having drawn it from the stores of his own invention. We do not think it likely, however, that his recitals were made without any kind of reality to build upon. Rodriguez,\* and after him Condamine, allude to reports of warlike females, which, they contend, must have more or less foundation in truth. When, however, we find the heroic damsels of the Maranon represent-

---

\* *Maranon y Amazonas*, fol. Madrid, 1684, ii. 12.

ed as cutting off one breast, and as meeting lovers on the frontier once a-year, we are transported back to the banks of the Thermodon, and become convinced that those parts of the story were furnished by Strabo and Diodorus, not by any Indian authority.

The Rio Negro is the most important tributary of the Maranon. Its dark tint is imputed by Mr Maw to an infusion of iron; by Rodriguez, to the clearness of the water, which renders the dark rocks beneath visible. At Barra, a town near the mouth of the Rio Negro, Mr Maw found himself again on the confines of the civilized world. There was a governor, troops, and European society. He ate bread for the first time for two months; the Portuguese up the river using merely the farina of manioc, which, throwing back the head, they pitch into the mouth with surprising dexterity; and Mr Maw suffered in their estimation by the little skill with which he executed this manœuvre.

Mr Maw concludes with some general observations, which are extremely sensible, and in a superior style to the rest of his book. The territory of the Maranon, including the immense tracts watered by its tributaries, is perhaps superior in natural capacities to any other region on the face of the globe. That of the Mississippi can alone come into competition, and has indeed many common features. But it has barrens, and inundated bottoms, which interrupt the general fertility. In the magnificent plain watered by the Maranon, no such interruptions have as yet been discovered. Even the tract immediately bordering the river, though forming so immense a plain, is so far elevated above the channel, as to be in no danger of being converted into swamp. This vast region, which might afford support to a crowded population, is occupied only by a few bands of savages, and a few handfuls of Europeans worse than savage. In order to bring it within the domain of culture and industry, the most powerful agent seemingly would be steam navigation. Mr Maw also suggests, that the introduction of steam navigation along the coasts of Brazil, would not only be of great commercial value, but would have a most salutary influence in making the power of the general government felt in places which are at present in a very lawless and turbulent state.

---

ART. IV.—1. *Monumenti Etruschi, o di Etrusco nome, disegnati, incisi, illustrati e pubblicati dal Cavaliere Francesco Inghirami. Badia Fiesolena dai torchi dal autore. 6 vols. 4to. 1821—1825.*

2. *Die Etrusker. Vier Bücher, von Karl Otfried Müller.* (The Etruscans, in four books, by K. O. Müller; an Essay which obtained the prize from the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin.) 2 vols. 8vo. Breslau. 1828.

THE origin of the Etruscan nation was involved in a degree of uncertainty, at the time when the earliest of our ancient historians wrote, which was hardly to have been expected, considering their extended dominion,—their immemorial possession of an alphabet,—the existence among them of a sacerdotal caste, and their acknowledged superiority in civilisation to all their European contemporaries, except the Greeks. Their subsequent history is chiefly known from their connexion with other nations; for never having cultivated their language, so as to attain to the possession of a *literature*, their writings have long since perished; and what they recorded on brass or marble, is far less intelligible than the hieroglyphics of Egypt. There has been no want of diligence on the part of the modern Tuscans, to collect and illustrate the ancient monuments of their country, and compare them with the Greek and Latin writers; the works which have been published on this subject within the last century attest their learning and their zeal; yet it must be confessed, that till the impartial criticism of writers beyond the Alps was exercised on the ample materials which the Italians had brought together, they had been used chiefly for the erection of hypotheses. The appearance of the two works, of which we have given the titles above, will afford us an opportunity of laying before our readers the combined result of the most recent antiquarian and historical research.

Our countryman, Thomas Dempster, may be said to have laid the foundation of an accurate knowledge of Etruscan history and antiquities. Several years of his wandering and eventful life were spent in Italy. In 1616 the Grand Duke invited him to teach jurisprudence at Pisa, and his residence there probably gave rise to his work *De Etruria Regali*. When he left Pisa, in 1619, to go to Bologna, he dedicated his book to the Grand Duke, and in his dedication offered to return and complete it whenever he should summon him. He taught at Bologna till his death, in 1625, but the *Etruria Regalis* remained in the same state in which he had left it, when

he quitted Pisa, and was not published till 1726. It was then given to the world by the munificence of an Englishman, Thomas Coke, afterwards Earl of Leicester, who greatly increased its value by the addition of numerous engravings of Etruscan antiquities and works of art, and a very correct transcript of the Eugubine Tables. A learned appendix, by Buonarroti, contains explanations of the plates. The *Etruria Regalis* is such a book as might have been expected from a man, whose boundless memory justified him in saying, that he knew not what it was to forget, but whose restless temper and frequent change of residence and pursuit, prevented his perfecting any work by mature reflection and persevering research. His four dynasties of Etruscan kings, beginning with Janus, the first after the deluge, and ending with Mæcenas, the progenitor of the friend of Augustus, are quite after the fashion of that age of historical criticism, when it would have been thought a great omission not to have traced an ancient people, at the latest, to a grandson of Noah; and when every dynasty began with a god, and numbered among its sovereigns mountains, rivers, and personifications of every kind. The reader, therefore, must not look for discrimination or selection, but he will find a complete repository of every thing in the classics connected with Etruscan history; of which succeeding writers have freely availed themselves. Dempster's works on Scottish history have fallen into low esteem, for he wanted that sturdy morality which is a necessary check on patriotic exaggeration; but his *Etruria Regalis*, and his *Paralipomena ad Rosinum*, will be lasting monuments of an extraordinary knowledge of antiquities. The publication of his long buried work, seems immediately to have kindled the zeal of the Tuscan antiquaries. When letters flourished under the patronage of the Medici, the curiosity of the learned had been directed towards the ancient languages of Italy; and researches had been made in the sepulchral chambers which surround most of the old Etruscan towns, by which inscriptions, urns, and various relics of antiquity had been obtained. But the seventeenth century was a period of political servitude to Italy; and the effects of that stagnation of intellect which has been so eloquently described by Sismondi,\* extended themselves even to the study of antiquities. The forgeries of Annius of Viterbo, and Curtius Inghirami, (whom the reader must be careful not to confound in a moment of chronological somnolence with the Cavaliere Francesco,) had, besides, disgusted

---

\* De la Littérature du Midi, ch. 15.

men with the whole science. The consequence was, that the monuments which had been disinterred, were dispersed and lost; and if any thing new was by accident brought to light, it shared the same fate. The sculptured sarcophagus was broken to pieces, burnt to lime, or converted into a horse trough; and what was not wantonly destroyed, was allowed to be corroded by exposure to the weather. Such neglect of the remains of antiquity marks a people stupidly incurious about the past; but have the citizens of Volterra been the only offenders? A few relics only had escaped in 1726, when Buonarroti made his drawings for the illustration of Dempster. The publication of his work, however, immediately led to new researches, and encouraged the Tuscan literati to cultivate the neglected field of their native antiquities. These researches were rewarded by so many discoveries in the neighbourhood of Volterra, that Buonarroti and Gori persuaded the Grand Duke to establish a Museum in that place for their reception. Not long after (1737) Gori himself published his *Museum Etruscum*, containing 200 plates of edited antiquities; Passeri, by his Dissertations subjoined to the Museum of Gori, his *Paralipomena ad Dempsterum*, and his *Picturæ Etruscorum in Vasculis*, (though the title of this last work involves a false hypothesis,) contributed perhaps more than any other man to diffuse the knowledge of the Etruscan monuments. Three brothers of the family Guarnacci especially distinguished themselves by their activity in carrying on excavations around Volterra, and collected a sufficient number of antiquities to form a museum of their own, little inferior to that of the town: their museum furnished the plates for the third volume of the *Museum Etruscum* of Gori, published in 1743, and it was united by the donation of Mario Guarnacci to the public Museum of Volterra, in 1785. The same spirit of research was extended to other places,—Perusia, Arezzo, Cortona, Tarquinii and Clusium: an Etruscan academy was established at Cortona in 1742, which has published nine volumes of its Dissertations. No country of equal extent with Tuscany can boast so large a body of antiquities, or so many works devoted to their illustration.

Volterra, however, as it was the first to give the example, has always continued the most conspicuous; and from its collections, almost exclusively, Inghirami has derived the subjects for his great work. It is an extraordinary production of the skill and labour of an individual;—the drawings having been wholly made by himself, and the engravings executed either by his own hand, or by pupils whom he had trained expressly for this purpose. It comprehends five different series;—Urns, (what are

more commonly called Sarcophagi,) Fictile Vases, Bronzes, Mystic Mirrors, (usually called *Pateræ*,) and Edifices, besides a volume of illustrative plates. Notwithstanding the splendour and costliness of the works in which Etruscan antiquities have been exhibited, no really faithful representations of them have been given till now. The artists who have been employed to make drawings of the fictile vases in particular, seem to have imagined that any defect of delineation or finish might be imputed to their want of skill: even the valuable atlas which accompanies Micali's *Italia avanti il Dominio dei Romani*, embellishes the Etruscan sculpture. Inghirami's engravings, on the contrary, are drawn and coloured with such exact fidelity, that the reader may form as correct an idea of them, as if he were accompanying the learned Director through his museum of Volterra. His descriptions are minute and clear, and his views and reasonings on subjects of art are comprehensive, and free from patriotic prejudice. We cannot say as much in praise of his explanations, which are prolix, and frequently appear to us to be fanciful. His leading principles are, that every thing in the antiquities of the subterraneous chambers must allude to the passage of the soul from this world to another; that the descent of the sun to Capricorn was regarded as symbolical of this passage; and that the Greek heroic history represents the course of the sun among the constellations. These things the author thinks he has established on the authority of Porphyry and Plotinus, Macrobius and Dupuis; so that whether a sculpture represent the decapitation of Medusa, or the mutual slaughter of Eteocles and Polynices, or any thing else, it finds its ready explanation.

The Academy of Sciences at Berlin, by proposing the Etruscans as the subject of a prize essay, showed their opinion, that the time was come when the scattered notices of the ancient writers should be combined with the discoveries in Etruscan antiquities which the last century brought to light, and the historical truth separated from the mass of contradictory theories, beneath which successive writers have buried it. Professor Müller, whose essay obtained the crown, is already known by his *Orchomenus und die Minyer*, and his *Dorier*; two works in which an extraordinary extent of reading in archæology and ancient literature is united to great sagacity in reconstructing from its fragments the ruined edifice of early Greek history. The present volumes, amidst a somewhat profuse display of reading, contain by far the best account extant, both of the history and the antiquities of Etruria, and fill up an important void in literature.

Even in ancient times it was a disputed question, whether



the Etruscans were Pelasgi from Greece, or Lydians from Asia, or indigenous in Italy; and the moderns have added more than an equal number to the hypotheses of the ancients. Maffei, Mazzocchi, and Guarnacci, deduce them from the Phœnicians;\* Buonarroti from the Egyptians; Pelloutier, Bardetti, and Freret from the Celts; while W. Von Humboldt supposes them to be a connecting link between the Iberians and the Latins. Müller adopts a middle course; he admits a primitive population of Etruria, whom he calls after Dionysius the *Rasænæ*, on whose origin he does not decide, but thinks there are grounds for assuming that these were mingled with a body of Pelasgian colonists from the coast of Lydia. We find in Greece a people bearing the name of Pelasgian Tyrrheni, driven from Bœotia by the Dorian migration, appearing as fugitives in Athens, and thence betaking themselves to Lemnos, Imbrus, and Samothrace, where, as well as on Mount Athos, they remained in the historic times. The name Tyrrhenian is applied to the Etruscans, in Hesiod (*Theog.* 1015;) in the Homeric hymn to Bacchus, to this people of the *Ægean*. That they were not the Tyrrhenians of Italy† by whom the god was carried off is evident; the pirates (l. 28) intended to carry him to Egypt or to Cyprus, not to Italy; and from other sources it appears, that the Mythus was a Naxian legend. Ovid (*Met.* III. 577—700) relates it at great length, and represents the Tyrrhenians as Mæonians. Now, on the coast of Mæonia or Lydia, there was a place named *Tυρρηα*, from which Müller (with the Abbé Sevin, *Mem. de l'Ac. des Inscr.* v) deduces the name Tyrrhenian; in all probability radically the same with Torrhebian, the name borne by the southern district of Lydia. He is inclined, however, to consider the people, to whom, from their occupation of *Tυρρηα*,

---

\* It is by an oversight that Müller, I. 81, reckons Bochart among those who explained Etruscan words from the Hebrew. Prone as he was to see his Phœnicians everywhere, he rejects the tempting etymology of Tyrrhenus from Tyre, and declares the language, manners, and superstitions of the two nations to be entirely different.—*Geogr. Sacr. lib. I. c. xxxiii.*

† Milton has given the story an Italian locality—

Bacchus, that first from out the purple grape  
Crush'd the sweet poison of misused wine,  
After the Tuscan mariners transform'd,  
Coasting the Tyrrhene shore, as the winds listed  
On *Circe's island fell.*

*Comus* l. 45.

But he was relating

What never yet was heard in tale or song  
From old or modern bard, in hall or bower.

the name Tyrrhenian was given, not as Lydians, but as Pelasgians, who settled for a time on this part of the coast, and having thence acquired their name, and made it notorious by their piracies in the Ægean, migrated first to the Malean promontory, and then to Etruria. In deriving them immediately from the Pelasgians, who came from Attica to Lemnos and Imbrus, and thence to Lydia, he seems to us to embarrass his hypothesis with an unnecessary difficulty. He himself makes the worship of the phallic Hermes, (I. p. 77, Herod. I. 57,) to be characteristic of the Pelasgi in Attica and the islands; yet of this he admits that hardly a trace is to be found in the Etruscan religion, (II. 73.) It is remarkable how late is the application of the name Pelasgian to the Tyrrhenians. Herodotus not only never calls them so, but even, by referring (I. 57) to the Crestonians, who live *above the Tyrrhenians*, for a proof of what the Pelasgic language was, he seems to imply that the Tyrrhenians themselves were, in his view, not Pelasgians; else why not take them at once for his illustration? No ancient author describes the Tyrrhenians of Lydia as Pelasgians from Attica or the islands. The genealogy of Herodotus from the Lydian authors, makes Tyrrhenus a son of Atys, King of Lydia; in that given by Dionysius without the author's name, (I. 27,) Lydus and Tyrrhenus are brothers; in that of Xanthus (ib. 28) the brothers are called Lydus and Torubus or Torrhebus; *i. e.* according to Müller, Tyrrhenus. Whichever of these we argue from, it appears very improbable, that the lineage of a band of Pelasgian pirates, who had settled on the coast of Lydia, should have been carried up to the ancient kings or gods of the country; and that, too, not by the Greeks, but by the Lydians themselves. We cannot, therefore, avoid the conclusion, that the Tyrrhenians were much more intimately connected with the Lydian population, than our author's account of them supposes. Niebuhr makes the Mæonians (the Homeric name of the Lydians) to be Pelasgians; arguing from the name of their stronghold Larissa, which is found in all countries occupied by the Pelasgians. Müller (I. 80) represents them as wholly different, alleging that no ancient author calls the Mæonians Pelasgians. This is true; but they make the Tyrrhenians Mæonians and also Pelasgians, and therefore imply, though they do not assert, the identity of the people who bore these three names.

The whole coast of Asia Minor appears to have been occupied by the Pelasgi, or nations differing from them only in name. Menecrates (apud Strab. xiii. 891, Falc.) related that the Pelasgi had occupied the whole of Ionia, from Mycale northward, and the adjacent islands; the Carians, the Leleges and Caucones,

the Trojans and the Mysians, were of the same race, (Strabo, 827,) and also allied to the Lydians, as appears from the genealogy, Her. i. 171. The Greeks themselves attribute the Pelasgic population of Asia Minor to colonies sent from Greece, or from the islands; but their accounts of colonies before the Homeric age, being founded on no contemporary authority, must generally be regarded as historical hypotheses, chiefly grounded upon similarity of names, which may often be more rationally explained from other causes. It is, however, by no means probable that the Lydians were wholly a Pelasgic people. The phenomena of the history of Asia Minor are most easily solved by the supposition, that a nation of Syrian origin was mingled in its two principal districts, Lydia and Phrygia, with another nearly allied to the Greeks. The Mosaic genealogy of nations (Gen. x. 22) assigns a Semitic origin to the Lydians; while it refers most of the tribes of Asia Minor, along with the Greeks, to the stock of Japheth. The mythology of Lydia, the basis, as usual, of its dynasties of kings, betrays its Syrian as well as Grecian affinities. Their deities, 'Αττης, or 'Ατυς, (the same as Παπας, Hes.) and Μᾶ, father and mother, have probably given their name to the Atyades and the Mæonians; and their worship is clearly the same with that of the Syrian goddess, who was variously denominated, Atargatis, Derceto, Semiramis, Rhea, Juno, and Venus. The chief seat of her worship, at Hierapolis, was the resort of the people of Asia Minor; and Ascalon in Phœnicia appears to have been considered as a colony of the Lydians (Steph. in voc.) for no other reason, than that the traditions of the great goddess were, in a peculiar manner, connected with this place. In the list of the kings of Troy, whose names are generally of Grecian etymology, the Oriental name of Assaracus points to a mixture of Oriental mythology; and this remark is still more applicable to the genealogy of the Heraclid kings of Lydia, in which Greek and Assyrian personages are so strangely mixed;—Hercules, Alcæus, Belus, Ninus, Agron. (Herod. i. 7.) If, then, the Lydians were a people partly Asiatic, partly allied to the Greeks, there is really no contradiction between those historians who call the Tyrrhenians Lydians, and those who speak of Tyrrhenian Pelasgians. The settlement of the Tyrrhenians at Malea, on their progress from Lydia to Italy, rests on very slight grounds—a passage in the commentator Lactantius, or Lutatius, on Statius, (Theb. iv. 224,) who calls the inventor of the Tyrrhenian trumpet, Maleus; but the resemblance between the Tuscan and the Lydian, or Phrygian music, really adds considerable weight to the other arguments in favour of the Oriental colonization of

Etruria. The musical instrument of the Greeks, in the heroic and Homeric age, was the lyre; the flute was unknown, or at least not in use; it has been long since remarked, that Homer mentions the *αυλός* only in two passages: (Il. x. 13, xviii. 495.) In the first of these he is describing the nightly noise of the Trojan camp, and the Villoison scholiast observes, that these instruments were known only to the Barbarians. This observation, though limited, is not contradicted by the other passage, in which youths are represented as dancing at a wedding to the sound of *lyres and flutes*. To say nothing of the suspicions which have been entertained, that the description of the shield of Achilles, of which this is a part, is not of the same age with the rest of the Iliad, it is very possible that the Greeks of Ionia may have employed the flute-players of Lydia or Phrygia at their festivities; or, should it be supposed that, in the days of Homer, the use of the flute was familiar to the Ionians themselves, the entire absence of all mention of it in the Odyssey, shows that in Greece itself it had not yet been introduced. It came in there along with the worship of Bacchus, which, whatever may have been its remoter origin, certainly passed from Lydia and Phrygia to Thrace, and thence into southern Greece, —drowning with its stormy music the feebler notes of the lyre:

Clamor, et inflato Berecynthia tibia cornu,  
Tympanaque, plaususque et Bacchei ululatus,  
Obstrepuere sono citharæ.—*Ovid, Met.* ix. 15.

The double flute, of which the left hand played a treble to the bass of the right hand, is mentioned by Herodotus, (i. 7,) under the name of *αυλὸς ἀνδρεῖος*, and *γυναικεῖος*, as used by the Lydians in war. Now, the double flute, as we know, both from ancient authors and from monuments,\* was in use among the Etruscans; and the Romans not only borrowed their flute-music from them, but generally employed at sacrifices, festive dances, and funerals, a Tuscan flute-player.

Inflavit cum pinguis ebur Tyrrhenus ad aras,  
Lancibus et pandis fumantia reddimus exta.—*Georg.* ii. 193.

---

\* The fictile vases are doubtful authorities, because most of them are not Etruscan, but Grecian; but in Inghirami, part iii. pl. 20, and ii. pl. 96, the double flute occurs on monuments unquestionably Etruscan. The reader will understand by *flute*, an instrument resembling the *oboe* in form and sound, not the oblique flute, though this was also known to the ancients under the name of *plagiaulus*.

*Indem presente modum tibicine Tusco,*

*Ludius equatam ter pede pulsat humum.—Ov. A. Am. i. 111.*

It is very improbable that such a coincidence between the Etruscan and Asiatic customs should be accidental; and no more probable explanation of it can be given, than by admitting that the Tyrrhenians were really a colony of Pelasgi from Lydia. They were probably not numerous, compared with the Rasenæ whom they found in possession of the country; and hence, though some of their arts were communicated to the nation among whom they settled, they were soon so completely absorbed in it, that the language of Etruria bore no traces either of a Greek or Lydian mixture. The adoption of the story of a Lydian origin, by no means requires that we should reject the accounts of migrations of Pelasgi from Thessaly, and from the opposite shore of the Adriatic to the mouths of the Po, which we find in other writers on Etruscan history. Professor Müller thus sums up this part of his researches:—

“ It remains, then, that we regard the Tuscan nation as an original and peculiar people of Italy; their language is widely different from the Greek; the names of their gods are not those which we find among the earliest Greeks whom we call Pelasgi, and which pass from them to the Hellenes; there is much too in the doctrine of their priests, entirely foreign to the Greek theology. But it appears to have been the fate of this nation, which never displayed any independent civilisation, but only adopted that of the Greeks, to have been indebted for its first impulse towards improvement to a Greek, or at best half Greek tribe. The Tuscans themselves, in their native legends, referred their polity and civilisation to the maritime town Tarquinii, and the hero Tarchon, both probably only variations of the name Tyrrheni. Here it was that the much dreaded Pelasgians of Lydia landed and settled, bringing with them the arts which they had acquired at home, or on their way. For the first time, the barbarous land saw men covered with brass array themselves for battle to the sound of the trumpet; here first they heard the loud sound of the Lydo-Phrygian flute accompanying the sacrifice, and perhaps witnessed for the first time the rapid course of the fifty-oared ship. As the legend, in its propagation from mouth to mouth, swells beyond all bounds, the whole glory of the Tuscan name, even that which did not properly belong to the colonists, attached itself to the name of Tarchon, the disciple of Tages, as the author of a new and better era in the history of Etruria. The neighbouring Umbrians and Latins named the nation, which from this time began to increase and diffuse itself, not from the primitive inhabitants, but from these new settlers. For since, in the Etruscan Tables, *Tursce* occurs along with *Tuscom* and *Tuscer*, it is impossible not to conclude, that, from the root TUR have been formed *Tursicus*, *Turscus*, *Tuscus*; as from the root OP, *Opseus* and *Oscus*, so that *Τυρρηνος*, or *Τυρσηνος*, and *Tusci*, are only the Asiatic and Italic forms of one and the same name.”—Vol. i. p. 100.

The time of such a colonization can, of course, only be fixed by approximation. Müller supposes it to have coincided with the Ionic migration, and to have been occasioned by it. The Umbrians were powerful in the land of which the new colonists took possession, and long wars must have been carried on with them, before they were dispossessed of the three hundred towns which Pliny (iii. 19) says they once held in the country which was afterwards Etruria. To the south, the Etrurians extended themselves to the banks of the Tiber, and even beyond it, into Latium, as the name of Tusculum proves. According to their own traditions, the same Tarchon who founded the twelve cities of Etruria, led a colony across the Appenines, and founded twelve other cities. Of such a tradition, the historian can receive no more than the fact, that Etruria, in the valley of the Po, was colonized from the southern Etruria. Bologna, anciently Felsina, which stands where the Appenines descend into the fertile plains which border the Po, was probably the first of these colonies; as it is called by Pliny, *princeps quondam Etruriæ*, (iii. 20 :) the names of most of the others are uncertain. A stone with an Etruscan inscription has been found (Lanzi, ii. p. 649) as far to the westward as Alessandria; Atria and Spina, near the mouth of the Po, were certainly Tuscan cities, and very important from their commerce with the Adriatic; but the foundation of both was claimed by mythologists for the Pelasgians of Thessaly, or the followers of Diomed. The same story of twelve colonies is repeated, in reference to the settlement of the Etruscans in Campania. Müller supposes these to be really colonies from Etruria, in opposition to the opinion of Niebuhr, who thinks they were founded by Pelasgian Tyrrhenians, confounded with the Etruscans from identity of name. At all events, the amount of Etruscan population in Campania cannot have been great, since the Oscan language, not the Etruscan, prevailed here; and not a single Etruscan inscription has been found in this whole district. This land of luxurious indulgence appears to have exerted its usual influence on the Etruscans, and they yielded the possession of it with little resistance to the Samnites, who poured down from the hills on the fertile plains of Campania.

In their Italian settlement, the Tyrrhenians appear to have retained long the practice of piracy, which had made their name notorious in the Grecian seas; indeed, it is sometimes difficult to decide whether the imputation falls on the Etruscans or the Tyrrhenians of the *Ægean*. • Possessing harbours on both seas, they maintained the command of both, and made themselves formidable not only to merchant ships by their corsairs,

but to the naval powers by their armaments. To their predominance in the Lower sea, Müller attributes the circumstance, that the Greeks, while they had numerous colonies on the eastern and southern coasts of Sicily, had only one, Himera, on the north, as late as the age of Thucydides. Indeed the dread of the Etruscans long prevented the Greeks from passing the straits of Rhegium with their ships; and it was not till the rise of the naval power of the Phocæans, (Herod. i. 163,) that either the Adriatic or the Tyrrhene sea were well explored by them. Rivalry soon followed; both nations endeavoured to possess themselves of Corsica, and the Etruscans, being joined by the Carthaginians, defeated the Phocæans, in the first naval battle (540 B. C.) in which Greeks had ever engaged the barbarians. They were less fortunate in their naval wars with the Dorians of Cnidos and Rhodes, who had made a settlement on the island of Lipara. In the time of Pausanias, a consecrated offering of the Liparæans was seen at Delphi, made from the spoils of the Tyrrhenians. Another trophy of the victory of the Greeks over them has been brought to light in our own times. In the year 474, B. C. the people of Cumea in Campania, being engaged in war with the Tyrrhenians, called in the aid of Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse, by whom they were totally defeated; and Greece, as Pindar says, (Pyth. i. 72,) delivered from slavery. In 1817, a brazen helmet was discovered among the ruins of Olympia, with the inscription, *HIAPON O ΔΕΙΝΟΜΕΝΕΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΙ ΣΤΡΑΚΟΣΙΟΙ ΤΟΙ ΔΙ ΤΥΡΑΝ ΑΠΟ ΚΥΜΑΣ*. 'Hiero the son of Dinomenes, and the Syracusans (consecrate) to Jupiter, Tyrrhenian (arms) from Cuma.' Two other helmets without inscriptions, but no doubt part of the same votive offering, were found at the same time.\*

Besides an historical introduction, Müller's work contains four books, of which the first treats of industry, commerce, and manufactures; the second of political and domestic life; the third of religion; and the fourth of the arts and sciences. These various subjects are treated in great detail, and with copious erudition.

It is not an easy task to paint the domestic manners and national character of a people who have transmitted no living image of themselves to posterity in literary compositions. The basis of the national prosperity of the Etruscans was agriculture, to which their soil and climate were well adapted, and which has always flourished in Tuscany, when the beneficence of nature

---

\* Boeckh, Corp. Inscr. i. p. 34. Comm. ad Pind. I. p. 224.

has not been counteracted by misgovernment and absurd legislation. But Etruria was not, like Campania, a land of spontaneous fertility; the industry and the ingenuity of man were required to adapt cultivation to the various qualities of the land, and to curb the inundations of the Po in the provinces on the Adriatic. Their primitive manners were simple; the distaff of Tanaquil was long preserved in the temple of Sancus at Rome; and a passage of Juvenal (vi. 288.) seems to imply, that in domestic industry and virtue there was a close resemblance between the Tuscan and the Roman matrons in early times. Their extensive conquests, and bold and skilful navigation, are a sufficient proof of the energy of their national character. But when commerce, and conquests in Southern Italy, had placed in their reach the means of indulgence, they seized upon them with the avidity of a half barbarous people; and luxury, instead of being the handmaid of refinement and elegance, ministered to vain splendour and sensual voluptuousness. Diodorus (v. 40.) describes, from Posidonius, their tables loaded twice a-day, (which to abstemious Greeks seemed the excess of gluttony,) their embroidered draperies, their drinking-vessels of gold and silver, and their hosts of slaves. Athenæus gives much darker shades to his picture of the corruption of manners produced by wealth expended wholly in the gratification of the senses. That the epithets of *pinguis et obesus*, which the Romans applied to the Etruscans, were not wholly suggested by national malice, is evident from the recumbent figures on the covers of the sarcophagi. From the Etruscans the Romans borrowed their combats of gladiators. It should seem, however, that the horrible practice of introducing them at banquets belonged chiefly to the Etruscans of Campania, and especially to Capua; the focus of all the vices which spring from luxury, neither softened by humanity nor refined by taste.

Of the Etruscan music we have spoken in mentioning the proofs of their Lydian origin. It was almost the only branch of art in which invention is attributed to them by the ancients; and even here the invention related only to the instrument; we read of no *mood* ascribed to them. Their celebrity, both in this and in the plastic arts, was owing, in great measure, to their being the neighbours of a people whose genius was so decidedly averse from both as that of the Romans; who, till they became acquainted with the Greeks, derived all the decorative part of their system of public and private life from the Etruscans.

We have no historical means of determining, whether the Etruscans borrowed from the Greeks their successive improvements in sculpture and statuary, or proceeded in an independent track:



the fact which we shall have to produce respecting their alphabet, renders the former supposition more probable. If this communication existed, however, it was only to a certain point; the Tuscan style in art, always bore a resemblance to that of Egypt, and their most perfect works had that rigidity and want of living and varied expression, which characterized Grecian sculpture before Phidias had fired his imagination with Homer's descriptions of Jupiter and Minerva, or Praxiteles had embodied in marble his vision of the Queen of Beauty. In all that department of art, on the contrary, in which mechanism without mind may attain perfection, the Etruscans were little inferior to the Greeks themselves. An Athenian poet, (Athen. i. 28,) celebrates their works in metal as the best of their kind; alluding probably to their drinking-vessels and lamps, candelabra and tripods.

The religion of the Greeks lent a powerful aid in perfecting the plastic art; that of the Etruscans, as far as it was peculiar to them, had nothing to impregnate the creative fancy of the artist, or to exult his conceptions to sublimity. They appear to have held an opinion, which we find both in the Northern and the Hindu theology, that the gods themselves were like the system over which they presided, the effects of a power exerted only at long intervals in the production of being, and absorbing into itself all that it had produced, to create again. The symbols of this power were the *Dii involuti* of Etruscan theology, whose names were unknown, and who were not objects of popular worship; of them Jupiter himself asked counsel: the *Dii consentes*, twelve in number, six of either sex, presided over the existing order of things, and received homage and sacrifice. Their intervention in human affairs was chiefly manifested in omens of impending evil, to be averted by gloomy, and often cruel, expiations. If morality may have gained something by the Etruscan religion having furnished nothing answering to the sportive, but licentious mythology of the Greeks, poetry and art undoubtedly suffered. The same want of lively and cheerful imagination, characterized their doctrine of the immortality of the soul: their subterraneous world was a Tartarus without an Elysium. No where was superstition reduced so completely to system. The regions of the heavens were divided and subdivided according to the Etruscan discipline, that every portent might have its accurate interpretation; the phenomena of the atmosphere, especially thunder and lightning, were observed, and classed with a minuteness which might have furnished the rudiments of a science, had the observers been philosophers instead of priests; but which, in fact, only augmented the subservience of the multitude to those who claimed the exclusive knowledge of the methods, by

which the gods might be propitiated. It is unnecessary to say, that philosophy, in the Grecian sense of the word,—free speculation on man, nature, and providence, combining its results into a system, was unknown in Etruria. Some practical knowledge of the laws of nature cannot be denied to a people who executed such works in architecture and hydraulics, as the Etruscans; but we are not aware that the discovery or demonstration of a single scientific truth can be claimed for them.

The form of the Etruscan government, in which the same order were both aristocracy and priesthood, effectually prevented the mind of the nation from expanding itself in its natural growth. To the *Lucumones*, an hereditary nobility, Tages revealed the religious usages which the people were to observe; and they kept to themselves the knowledge of this system, with the power of applying it as they thought best for perpetuating their own monopoly. In their civil capacity, the *Lucumones* formed the ruling body in all the cities of Etruria. In earlier times we read of kings, not of the whole country, but of separate states, whose power no doubt was greatly narrowed by that of the aristocracy; but they disappear after a time altogether, as from the Grecian and Roman history; while no body corresponding to the *plebs* arose, to represent the popular element in the constitution. It is difficult to fix the exact relation of the great body of the ruling caste. Müller inclines to the opinion, that the cultivators of the soil were chiefly bondsmen to the landowners—as the *Penestæ* in Thessaly, and the *Helots* in Sparta. That such a class existed in Etruria is certain (Dion. ix. 5.); that it included so large a proportion of the people, is not probable; and the only argument adduced in support of it is, the very doubtful assumption that the clients at Rome were bondsmen of the patricians. Unquestionably the Etruscan aristocracy kept the lower orders in political subjection, and the nation was thus prevented from rising to that eminence which it might have attained; but its general prosperity is a proof that the government was not tyrannically exercised. The spirit of democracy appears not even to have stirred, so as to awaken the fears of the ruling caste, and lead them to severity. The insurrections of which we read are expressly attributed to the slaves.

Etruria was fruitful in corn, especially in *spelt*, the *far*, or *ador*, of the Latins; of which the meal furnished the *puls*, which was the ancient food of the inhabitants of all this part of Italy and agriculture formed the most honourable occupation:—

Sic fortis Etruria crevit,

Scilicet et rerum facta est pulcherrima Roma. *Georg.* II. 533.

The iron mines of Elba, (*Insula inexhaustis chalybum generosa*

metallis *Æn.* x. 174,) and others on the main land of Etruria connected with them, furnished a richer supply, and of a purer kind, than any in the ancient world: the same island produced the copper for their coinage, and for their works in brass.

There is one article of commerce, in which, on very insufficient grounds, Müller supposes them to have traded—we mean amber. This substance, he thinks, they received by a route of inland commerce, extending from the shores of the Adriatic to those of the Baltic. His arguments are chiefly derived from the circumstance, that in Pliny's time, it was conveyed by this route; and that, as the production of amber was always connected by the ancients with the fable of Phaeton, and referred to the mouth of the Eridanus, where, however, it was certainly not produced, it must have been brought thither by the same route in the earliest times. But we much doubt whether the original fable of the Eridanus had such a precise locality. Diodorus places this river among the Atlantei (iii. 57); and when he says that Helios had been drowned in it, he gives substantially the same etymology of the name, which is involved in the common story of Phaeton.\* The Atlantei, according to Plato (*Tim.* § 6),—who is surely here recording old fables, and adapting them to his purpose, not inventing,—occupied the whole western world, as far as Egypt on the one side, and Tyrrhenia on the other. Now, though the place whence amber was brought was long a secret to the Greeks, they must soon have perceived its combustible, and consequently resinous nature; and the hypothesis which seemed most plausible to Tacitus, was the most obvious to them. ‘*Fœcundiora igitur nemora lucosque sicut orientis secretis, ubi thura balsamaque sudantur, ita occidentis insulis terrisque inesse crediderim, quæ vicini solis radiis expressa atque liquentia in proximum mare labuntur ac vi tempestatum in adversa littora exundant.*’ *Germ.* 45. The name of the island Basilea, where amber was supposed to be found, is evidently derived from the Atlantean fable. Eridanus, therefore, was at first only the fabulous river of the West: when geography became better known, the name was variously attached to the Rhone and the Po, and finally became appropriated to the latter. That when the Baltic was ascertained to be the real source of amber, there was also found a small river, called Raduna, falling into it near Dantzic, is a curious coincidence, but nothing more. In addition to the reason above mentioned, why the ancients should have supposed amber to be pro-

---

\* Riemer, in his Greek and German Lexicon, derives it from *αἶμα*, and *δανωσ*, dried up.

duced in the furthest regions of the West, it was probably brought in that direction by the Phœnicians; who, however, may not have entered the Baltic themselves, but have obtained it from some entrepôt. Müller, indeed, (i. 285.) denies this; but in the earliest mention of amber, (Odys. xv. 459,) we find the Phœnician pirates kidnapping a Grecian maiden by means of an amber necklace set in gold; and it will hardly be said that they had fetched it from the recesses of the Adriatic. To the common opinion that the Phœnicians brought both tin and amber from the West, he objects, that then Herodotus (vii. 126,) could not have doubted of the existence of a sea on that side of Europe. But Herodotus only says, that he could meet with no eye-witness of the fact; as others in his age evidently believed it, they must have been more successful. If he enquired at Tyre respecting the country whence amber came, he would probably not receive a more satisfactory answer, than would have been given to an English merchant, who enquired of the Dutch East India Company, how they got their cinnamon and nutmegs. We have observed the imagination of the Germans to be unusually susceptible on the subject of these ancient inland routes of commerce. Heeren only needs a camel and a desert, and he immediately bodies forth a caravan, bringing ivory and gold dust, or 'all the spice and gems of the East.' We fear that our author's *Handels strasse* through the wilds of Gaul and the woods of Germany before the days of Homer, glittering with stream-tin and amber beads,—sending one branch to the Mediterranean, and the other to the Adriatic, is constructed of materials not more solid than some of those of his learned colleague. The account which Pliny gives of the mission of a Roman knight sent by the præfect who had the charge of the exhibition of gladiators in the time of Nero, to procure a supply of amber, is very curious. He passed through Pannonia to the coast of the Baltic, and returned with such an enormous quantity, that not only the network which surrounded the arena, and protected the spectators from the spring of the wild beasts, was knotted with amber; but even the arms of the gladiators, and the bier on which the slaughtered bodies were carried away for interment, were covered with the same material. Plin. Hist. Nat. xxxvii. 11.

The recent investigations of Niebuhr and others into the early history of Rome, have given additional interest to the enquiry into the connexion between the Etrurians and the Romans. Müller is a pupil of the great historian, but he does not follow him with any blind devotion to his opinions; and we really think has devised a more probable hypothesis than Niebuhr's respecting the predominance of Etruria over Rome

in the reigns of the Tarquins. They agree in preferring the Etruscan account of Servius Tullius, (as preserved in the speech of the Emperor Claudius, when proposing the admission of provincials into the senate), according to which, his real name was Mastarna, and he had been a leader of Tuscan Condottieri, to the Roman, which made him the son of a slave. But while Niebuhr departs so widely from history, as to suppose that Tarquinius Priscus was not an Etruscan at all, but one of his imaginary *Latini Prisci*, Müller considers his name, and that of Tarquinius Superbus, as indicating rather the supremacy of Tarquinii among the states of Etruria; and the incorporation of Rome with its dominions, as the most southern point to which they reached. We call this a more probable opinion than Niebuhr's, without admitting that either of them deserves to take the place of the common story; nor can we understand how a history, which in a preceding reign is so distinct, that not only the personality of Servius, but his country and condition are satisfactorily ascertained, should, in the next, become so doubtful, that a king of Rome is not to be distinguished from a symbol of Tarquinian predominance. This inconsistency pervades all the opinions of the Niebuhrian school, respecting the times of the Roman kings: at one moment their very existence is doubtful; at another it is so far from being questioned, that their motives are reasoned upon, and their actions minutely discussed. There can be no doubt, however, that Rome was really conquered by Porsena. Beaufort long since exposed the artifices by which the Romans had endeavoured to hide this humiliating fact. But from this time the balance began to incline more and more to the opposite side. Almost at the moment when Veii fell, the Celts and other barbarous tribes, who had already made deep encroachments on the Etruscan possessions along the Po, made themselves masters of the country on its southern bank, as far as Bologna. As the torrent of the Celtic invasion rolled on, Rome itself was buried in it for a time; but it emerged more formidable than ever, and almost immediately conquered and colonized that part of Etruria which lies southward of the Ciminian Forest. Campania was already seized by the Sennites, and all northward of the Appenines remained permanently in the possession of the Gauls. The temporary confederations of the Etruscans could offer no effectual resistance to the policy which had 'organized victory' in the Roman armies. After their first great defeat at the Vadimonian lake, they tried the effect of hiring Gallic auxiliaries, but were again beaten; and the power of Etruria had been effectually broken before the struggle with Pyrrhus and Hannibal began.

Enough remains of Etruscan art to justify what ancient authors have said of the population, wealth, and luxury of this people. The walls of their cities rarely exhibit that gigantic species of dike building which has been called the Cyclopean architecture, and which is found in Asia Minor, in the Peloponnesus, and the remains of the ancient towns of Latium and Samnium. Micali considers the walls of Cossa as the only specimen in Etruria of Cyclopean architecture; but, if the criterion be the use of polygonal masses of stone without cement, instead of parallelopipedal, the plate (Pl. 12.) which he has given of the gate and wall of Signum, (Segni,) shows that it partakes of the character of this class. But, in general, they built their walls, as may be seen at Volterra, Populonia, and Rusellæ, of vast blocks of parallelopipedal form, which their own weight retained in their places, without the use of mortar. The gate of Segni, before mentioned, shows something of the earliest attempt at constructing an arch, by the gradual approximation of the stones which form the sides. Etruria does not exhibit any specimens of the mode of building practised in the treasuries of Atreus and Minyas, in which the walls of a circular building converge so as to meet at the top, in the form of a bee-hive. A recent traveller, Della Marmora, has discovered several of this kind in the island of Sardinia. There can be no doubt that they are the *tholi* of which the ancients speak; but their traditions connect the architectural works of this island so distinctly with Iolaos and Dædalus, that Müller's reference of them (ii. 23) to the Etruscans seems questionable.

We are indebted for by far the most numerous of our Etruscan antiquities to the care with which this people provided themselves with durable places of sepulture, and their custom of interring with the body various articles of metal and clay. We have already observed, that to the opening of the *hypogæa* of Volaterra we owe the revival of this branch of antiquarian lore. Some of these repositories belonged to ancient towns, whose existence might have been unknown but for the necropolis which marks their vicinity. Inghirami has given an interesting account (Ser. iv.) of two of these; one at Castellaccio, not far from Viterbo, the other at Orchia, about fourteen miles to the southwest of that city. Castellaccio was the Castellum Axium mentioned by Cicero in his oration for Cæcina, (c. 7.)—the site of which Cluverius declared to be unknown. The distance, fifty-three miles from Rome, corresponds with the account of Cicero; the site of the ruined castle, though itself of more recent architecture, is precisely that which Virgil assigns to the ancient cities of Italy:

‘ — Congesta inanu præruptis oppida saxis,  
Fluminaque antiquos subter labentia muros.’ *Georg.* ii. 156.

The traces of the walls themselves are very visible in the large oblong blocks of *peperino* joined without cement, and convex outwards, in the usual style of the old Etruscan fortifications. The steep banks of the stream being composed of a tufo easily wrought, have been hewn out, for more than a mile, into grotto-sepulchres, the face of the rock being cut into the representation of a doorway, while the real entrance to the hypogeum is below, and closed with large stones. Examples of this kind of sepulchre are found in Persia, in Palestine, and in Asia Minor, (*Walpole's Memoirs*, i. 231. ii. 206, 524;) but in these the entrance is by the sculptured portal, which in the Etruscan sepulchres served only as an ornament. Flights of steps descend to the fronts from the summit of the hill. The execution is in general simple, consisting of the representation of a doorway with converging lintels, supporting a cornice of several members, usually with an inscription in Etruscan characters. Sometimes the front of the rock has been cut away, so as to form a kind of vestibule. At Orchia, one of these vestibules, like the tombs of Persepolis, is a complete architectural front, with pilasters, frize, and a pediment, with sculptures in the tympanum. The architecture is evidently of an age when the Greek embellishments had become known in Etruria; but the shortness of the pillars, the breadth of the intercolumniation, and the heaviness of the upper parts, agree very well with the character which *Vitruvius* (iii. 3) gives to the Tuscan buildings, *Varicæ, baricephalæ et humiles et latæ*. As time has not spared a single public edifice of the Etruscans, it is only by means of their sepulchres, or the representations of their buildings in paintings and bas reliefs, that we can judge what their architecture really was; and even here we find very few traces of it. (*Müller*, ii. 24.) It is nearly allied to the Doric, and not properly a distinct order; whether so allied, in consequence of the affinity of the Etruscans and Greeks, or borrowed by the former, and varied, to adapt it to edifices of wood, as theirs commonly were, appears doubtful.

Within these sepulchral chambers were disposed cinerary urns of stone, sometimes ranged around the sides, on the ground; sometimes on an amphitheatre of steps; and sometimes in niches, like the Roman columbaria. Instances of bodies interred without burning are very rare. The urns themselves are commonly of tufo or alabaster, and of an oblong form, about two feet in length, and of the same height, including the cover, on which the recumbent figure of the deceased is often carved. In the sepulchres of Volterra, urns of baked

earth are very rare, stone being there abundant; in those of Clusium and Montepulciano they are common. The urns of stone are variously ornamented on the side which was meant to be turned from the wall; sometimes with leaves, flowers, and heads; often with bas reliefs, representing subjects from the Greek heroic history; and others, whose meaning is unknown, but generally of a gloomy kind. One representation is very common—a figure on horseback, with the head muffled in his robe, accompanied by a fierce-looking personage, with ears of a satyr, an enormous Roman nose, and a pickaxe or hammer in his hand, sometimes a sword; supposed to be Mantus, the Tuscan Genius of Death, conveying the traveller to his last home. According to Tertullian, (ad Nat. i. 10,) a figure similarly armed, and named Dispater, used to fetch the dead bodies of the gladiators from the Roman arena; and on another urn of Volterra, we see two of the Furies, who are assailing Orestes, with the hammer in their hands. The urns of baked clay were meant to contain ashes, and must not be confounded with the *fictile vases* which are very commonly found in the Etruscan sepulchres. As they were first discovered in Etruria, the name of Etruscan was given to them, and continued to be used after it was known that they were found more abundantly in the sepulchres of Magna Græcia, and even in Attica, and the islands of the Egean. That the custom of depositing them in sepulchres, for whatever purpose, was common to Etruria and to the south of Italy is certain; but there is no reason to suppose that it originated in Etruria, or that those which are found in Campanian or Sicilian sepulchres are of Etruscan manufacture. On the contrary, it is probable that those found in Etruria are the production of Greek artists; their subjects, their style of painting, and design, are completely Greek; and though the Etruscans have inscribed every other work of art with their own characters, no painted vase has yet been found with any other than a Greek inscription.\* The ancients frequently celebrate the pottery of the Etruscans, but do not attribute to them any particular skill in painting them. The vases of Arretium, so frequent-

---

\* A single exception exists in the fragment of pottery, found probably at Volterra, (Inghirami Ser. V. Tav. 55. No. 8.), which exhibits a Triton and a goddess riding on a marine monster, with the legend in Etruscan letters, TRITVN ALACRA. But the style is Greek, and so are the words; Alacra being evidently formed from ἄλς and ἀνρός, the same, perhaps, as the Salacia of the Romans. (Gell. xiii. 22.) Greek artists probably took up their residence in Etruria.



ly mentioned in the classics, are of quite a different kind from those found in sepulchres; fragments of them abound in the neighbourhood of Arezzo, and Inghirami has engraved some of them. (Ser. v. Tav. 1.) They are of very fine clay, of a bright red colour, and with figures in relief, modelled after Greek patterns probably, but with Latin inscriptions. Statues of the gods in clay, of Tuscan fabric, were the chief ornaments of the Roman temples in the earliest times.

‘Rebus Latiis aurem præstare solebat

Fictilis et nullo violatus Jupiter auro.’ *Juv.* xi. 115.

Every collection of antiquities contains specimens of what are called Etruscan *pateræ*, very generally found with the urns and vases in the sepulchral chambers. They are shallow disks of brass, frequently without any concavity, but bordered by a rim slightly raised, and having a handle of the same metal. On the disk are generally engraved scenes of mythological and heroic history, with legends in the Etruscan character;—a circumstance which has rendered them peculiarly important to the antiquary for comparing the Etruscan mythology with the Greek. It seems singular that the name of *patera* should ever have been applied to them: far from being suitable for drinking vessels, they could not even hold the small quantity of wine necessary for a libation; and wherever a libation is represented on ancient monuments, it is performed with a vessel, comparatively shallow indeed, as its name implies, but very different from an Etruscan *patera*, and always without a handle, except in some unskilful restorations. Inghirami, who has published two series of these antiquities, contends at great length against the common name, and calls them *specchi mistici*. That they were really mirrors we have little doubt; Inghirami easily finds a mystical meaning for every thing belonging to them. The metal of which they are invariably composed, brass, alludes to the firmament, conceived by the ancients to be a *χαλκοβατέες δῶ*, ‘spread out like a molten mirror,’ (Job, xxxvii. 18;) their circular form, to the perfection of which this figure is the emblem. If they had happened to be oval, he would still have been at no loss; for he explains the usually elliptical forms of the fictile vases, as alluding to that deterioration of its nature which the soul undergoes when it enters into union with the body. As many articles of female ornament have been found in sepulchres,—fibulæ, hair-bodkins, collars, bracelets,—it is an obvious conjecture, that the mirrors were a real part of the toilet of the deceased, consigned to the same grave with her;—on the principle that what was most used and valued in life should be the companion in death. Yet, to this supposition, it is an objection, that the slight convexity

which some of them have is on the polished side—a circumstance which, as it would interfere with their use as real mirrors, suggests that they may have been emblematical of the sacerdotal office borne by the female with whom they were interred.

The literature of the Etruscans presents the singular phenomenon of an alphabet perfectly deciphered, along with a language completely unintelligible. Such a combination is so strange, that we find more than one writer alleging that the language is Greek, and appealing in proof to the alphabet, without suspecting the want of connexion between premises and conclusion. When the Eugubine tables were discovered in 1444, they were supposed to be in the Egyptian character; Reinesius suspected them to be Punic; and though they gradually acquired the name of Etruscan, the real force of the letters was not discovered till 1732, when Bourguet ascertained it by comparing the two tables which are in the Latin character, with one in the Etruscan, which he had happily divined to be nearly equivalent in sense. Gori, a few years later, published his alphabet, which in all important points has been confirmed by subsequent enquiries: the great improvement made in it by Lanzi was, that he detected a  $\Sigma$  in the letter M, which till then had been taken for an *m*. The principles of Greek palæography have been lately established on a more solid basis than before, by Boeckh; and by the help of these and the labours of his predecessors, Müller has arrived at the conclusion, that the Etruscan alphabet has not been derived immediately from the Phœnicians, but from the Greeks. Very few forms occur in it, which are not found in the early Greek inscriptions; while on the other hand it does not contain some of those which the Greeks retained a considerable time after they received them from the Phœnicians; and again the Etruscans have some letters which the Greeks added to their Phœnician alphabet. Other Etruscan letters have never yet been found in any Greek inscriptions, so that it is impossible to point out any specific age or form of the Greek alphabet which the Etruscans may be supposed to have adopted once for all. The Phrygian inscription from the tomb of Midas (Walpole, ii. 207) bears no closer resemblance to the Etruscan, than other very old Greek inscriptions: in the Carian inscription, (ib. 530,) there are many letters which differ from the Etruscan. The letters B, Δ, Γ, do not appear to have had any corresponding sound in the Etruscan language, and the two first never occur: Γ is found in the form C, in which it appears on the coins of Magna Græcia. The digamma F, occurs both in this form, and in that of Ϝ, which is found in Greek inscriptions and

coins; they had also for the same sound the character 8, for which a circle or square with crossing lines is also used, as in the oldest Greek inscriptions. It is remarkable, that the Etruscan F in proper names always answers to the Latin V, Fipi to Vibius, Felethri to Volaterra, Menarfe to Minerva; whence Müller (ii. 300) takes occasion to dispute the opinion of Bp. Marsh, that the Latin F represented the Greek digamma, observing that it is only before R that the digamma becomes F. The same character was also used for H and Th. So that there seems in fact to have been one letter for the labial, dental, and guttural aspirate. The vowel O appears to have been unknown to the Tuscan language; for Q they used *chf* and *cf*. Of the Greek forms V and Y, which both occur on early monuments, they have chiefly used the former, but not exclusively. For X they have the form which is frequent in Boeotian inscriptions, resembling an inverted anchor; for Z a double cross; Ψ, Z, the long vowels H and Ω are unknown to their alphabet. With very few exceptions, their writing is from right to left; and as this mode had been departed from by the Greeks in their earliest extant inscriptions, which may perhaps ascend to the 40th Olympiad, (620 B. C.), it seems reasonable to admit that the introduction of writing into Etruria was something earlier. Demaratus, who is said to have brought both painting and letters from Corinth, if really expelled by Cypselus, must have lived about the 30th Olympiad. A more recent character, which is most commonly found in sepulchral inscriptions, seems to have been introduced about the end of the third century after the building of Rome; at which time, according to Müller (ii. 301), the Latin alphabet was also formed; but from the Greek, not from the Etruscan. The Umbrians appear to have adopted the Etruscan alphabet, though their language was essentially different, and more resembling the Oscan and the Latin. The Oscan alphabet also appears to have been borrowed from the Etruscan, not immediately from the Greek. It is difficult to say when the Etruscan character fell into entire disuse; the style of ornament on some of the urns on which it is found, refers them to the times of the Roman empire.

The language of Etruria, never having been polished by the influence of literature—for its histories were probably mere chronicles, and its theological writings, liturgies and manuals of a gloomy superstition—remained harsh to the ear, and uncouth to the eye. Such combinations of letters as *eplc*, *srancxt*, *thunculthl* (Müller, ii. 288), can scarcely have been pronounced at all, without the intervention of a short vowel, after the manner of the oriental languages. In regard to the interpretation of the

language, it must be acknowledged, that all the labour which has hitherto been bestowed upon it, though valuable for its collateral results, has been nearly fruitless in respect to its direct object. When Lanzi, abandoning the former method of oriental or northern etymology, endeavoured to explain the Etruscan from the Pelasgic, it was natural to expect a more favourable issue : a close affinity, if not identity, of the two nations, was maintained by many of the ancients, and the alphabets were visibly the same. For many years after the appearance of his *Saggio di Lingua Etrusca* (1789), his explanations were generally acquiesced in, and made the basis of other etymological speculations. But when time had been given for examination, it could not but be perceived, that his modes of proceeding were too arbitrary to warrant confidence; that he could produce no evidence of the actual existence of many of the words and forms which he supposed to be Greek in order to identify them with the Etruscan; and that other monuments discovered since his time could not be in any way explained by his system. Niebuhr, in his *Roman History*, avers, that among all the ‘ Etruscan ‘ words of which explanations have been pretended, only two— ‘ *avil ril, vixit annos*—seem to have been really explained;’ and of these, Müller assures us (i. 64), and apparently with good reason, that *avil* (ævum) signifies not *vixit* but *ætatis*. Müller’s observations on this subject are particularly deserving of attention at the present moment, when extravagant expectations appear to be entertained of the enlargement of our historical knowledge by the comparison of languages. ‘ We might give much ampler information, if, after Lanzi’s method, we sought in the monuments ‘ of the Etruscan language for single sounds resembling the ‘ Greek and Latin; and, persuaded that similar sounds must have ‘ a similar meaning, endeavoured to explain all that could not ‘ be brought to agree, by an arbitrary Prothesis, Epenthesis, ‘ Paragoge, and similar cheap expedients. Without blaming the ‘ learned Italian, in whose time the most eminent literati had ‘ very confused ideas of the formation of language, we may maintain, that his leading principle—that analogy is the character ‘ only of cultivated languages, and that the ruder any language is, the greater liberty might be taken in the use of it— ‘ is entirely false. This may justify us for having paid so little ‘ regard to etymologies, which, as they are arbitrary in themselves, suppose an arbitrary character in the language to which ‘ they are applied. If we use only genuine monuments, and require a certain evidence for every explanation of a root or a ‘ grammatical form, our apparent knowledge of the Etruscan ‘ language shrinks almost to nothing.—It is not probable that

‘ the application of the still existing remains of the languages of the north and north-west of Europe, should have those beneficial results for our knowledge of the Etruscan, which some appear to anticipate. The Germans and Celts are originally divided from the nations on the Mediterranean by their locality in a very marked manner; they only gradually approach these and come into collision with them; and even though the languages of both nations may belong to that great family, which from time immemorial has diffused itself through Europe and Asia, yet they have distinct peculiarities, which we have no reason to believe are found in those of Italy. One fundamental and indelible characteristic of the Celtic languages seems to be, that they mark grammatical forms by aspiration and other changes of the *initial* consonants; a thing not practised in any other European language, but found in all branches of the Celtic,—Welsh, Cornish, Gaelic, Irish, and *bas Bréton*. This mutability of the consonants is a circumstance which must be perceptible, even in a small number of written remains, and which could not well have escaped us, had the Etruscan been Celtic. The Iberian family, once widely diffused on the shores of the Mediterranean, may have dwelt in close vicinity to the Etruscans; but the remains of its language in the Basque are completely different from those of the rest of Europe, and its grammar shows so little affinity with what we know of the Etruscan, as to afford very slight support to the opinion of the affinity of the two nations. What may have been the relation of the Tuscan to the extinct Ligurian, or to the language of those Alpine tribes whose names alone are preserved in history, is a question respecting which we have not even a glimmering of knowledge.’ Vol. I. p. 64, et seq.

After the experience which Egypt has afforded us, we may be convinced that any attempt to interpret the Etruscan, without the aid of bilingual inscriptions, will be pure loss of labour. If the translation were not in Latin or Greek, but in the Oscan or even Umbrian, these languages have so much affinity to the Latin, that much might be learnt from such an inscription for the explanation of the Etruscan. The discovery of such a monument is, in regard to time and manner, an incalculable event; but it is within the range of reasonable expectation, and the age which has witnessed the interpretation of Hieroglyphics, should despair of nothing.

ART. V.—*Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel Defoe : containing a Review of his Writings, and his opinions upon a variety of important matters, Civil and Ecclesiastical.* By Walter Wilson, Esq. of the Inner Temple. 3 vols. 8vo. London, 1830.

**T**HIS is a very good book, but spun out to too great a length. Mr Wilson will not bate an inch of his right to be tediously minute on any of the topics that pass in review before him, whether they relate to public or private matters, the author's life and writings, or the answers to them by Tutchin and Ridpath. He is indeed so well furnished with materials, and so full of his subject, that instead of studying to reduce the size of his work, he very probably thinks he has shown forbearance in not making it longer. We could not wish a more distinct or honest chronicler. There is scarcely a sentence, or a sentiment in his work, that we disapprove, unless we were to quarrel with what is said in dispraise of the *Beggar's Opera*. In general, his opinions are sound, liberal, and enlightened, and as clear and intelligible in the expression as the intention is upright and manly. The style is plain and unaffected, as is usually the case where a writer thinks more of his subject than of himself. Mr Wilson appears as the zealous and consistent friend of civil and religious liberty ; and not only never swerves from, or betrays his principles, but omits no opportunity of avowing and enforcing them. He has 'excellent iteration in him.' If he repeats the old story over again, that liberty is a blessing, and slavery a curse,—if he depicts persecution and religious bigotry in the same unvarying and odious colours, and never sees the phantom of *divine right* without proceeding to have a tilting-bout with it,—as honest Hector Macintire could not be prevented by his uncle, Mr Jonathan Oldbuck, from encountering a *scal* whenever he saw one,—we confess, notwithstanding, that we like this pertinacity better than some people's indifference or tergiversation. The biographer of Defoe, like Defoe himself, is a Whig, and of the true stamp ; that is, he is a stanch and incorruptible advocate of Whig principles, and of the great aims the leaders of the Revolution had in view, as opposed to the absurd and mischievous doctrines of their adversaries ; though this does not bribe his judgment, but rather makes him more anxious in pointing out and lamenting the follies, weaknesses, and perversity of spirit, which sometimes clogged their proceedings, defeated their professed objects, and turned the cause of justice and freedom into a by-word, and the instrument of a cabal.

Mr Wilson cannot be charged with going too copiously or indiscriminately into the details of Defoe's private life. The anecdotes and references of this kind are 'thinly scattered to make 'up a show,'—*rari nantes in gurgite vasto*. Little was known before on this head, and the author, with all his diligence and zeal, has redeemed little from obscurity and oblivion. But he makes up for the deficiency of personal matter, by a superabundance of literary and political information. All that is to be gleaned of Defoe's individual history might be stated in a short compass.

Daniel Defoe, or Foe, as the name was sometimes spelt, was born in London in the year 1661, in the parish of St Giles's, Cripplegate. His father, James Foe, was a butcher; and his grandfather, Daniel, the first person among his ancestors of whom any thing is positively known, was a substantial yeoman, who farmed his own estate at Elton, in Northamptonshire. The old gentleman kept a pack of hounds, which indicated both his wealth and his principles as a royalist; for the Puritans did not allow of the sports of the field, though his grandson (*contra bonos mores*) sometimes indulged in them. In alluding to this circumstance, Defoe says, 'I remember my grandfather had a huntsman, who used the same familiarity (that of giving party names to animals) with his dogs; and he had his Roundhead and his Cavalier, his Goring and his Waller; and all the generals in both armies were hounds in his pack, till, the times turning, the old gentleman was fain to scatter his pack, and make them up of 'more dog-like surnames.' It was probably from this relative that Defoe inherited a freehold estate, of which he was not a little vain; and which seems to have influenced his opinions in his theory of the right of popular election, and of the British constitution. His father was a person of a different cast—a rigid dissenter; and from him his son appears to have imbibed the grounds of his opinions and practice. He was living at an advanced age in 1705. The following curious memorandum, signed by him at this period, throws some light on his character, as well as on that of the times:—'Sarah Pierce lived with us, about fifteen or sixteen years since, about two years, and behaved herself so well, that we recommended her to Mr Cave, that godly minister, which we should not have done, had not her conversation been according to the gospel. From my lodgings, at the Bell in Broad Street, having lately left my house in Throgmorton Street, October 10, 1705. Witness my hand, JAMES FOE.'

Young Defoe was brought up for the ministry, and educated with this view at the dissenting academy of Mr Charles Morton, at Newington-Green, where Mr Samuel Wesley, the father of

the celebrated John Wesley, and who afterwards wrote against the dissenters, was brought up with him. Whether from an unsettled inclination, or his father's inability to supply the necessary expenses, he never finished his education here. He not long after joined in Monmouth's rebellion in 1685, and narrowly escaped being taken prisoner with the rest of the Duke's followers. It is supposed he owed his safety to his being a native of London, and his person not being known in the west of England, where that movement chiefly took place. He now applied himself to business, and became a kind of hose-factor. He afterwards set up a Dutch tile-manufactory at Tilbury, in Essex, and derived great profit from it; but his being sentenced to the pillory for his *Shortest Way with the Dissenters*, (one of the truest, ablest, and most seasonable pamphlets ever published,) and the heavy fine and imprisonment that followed, involved him in distress and difficulty ever after. He occasionally, indeed, seemed to be emerging from obscurity, and to hold his head above water for a time, (and at one period had built himself a handsome house at Stoke-Newington, which is still to be seen there,) but this show of prosperity was of short continuance; all of a sudden, we find him immersed in poverty and law as deeply as ever; and it would appear that, with all his ability and industry, however he might be formed to serve his country or delight mankind, he was not one of those who are born to make their fortunes,—either from a careless, improvident disposition, that squanders away its advantages, or a sanguine and restless temper, that constantly abandons a successful pursuit for some new and gilded project. Defoe took an active and enthusiastic part in the Revolution of 1688, and was personally known to King William, of whom he was a sort of idolater, and evinced a spirit of knight-errantry in defence of his character and memory whenever it was attacked. He was released from prison (after lying there two years) by the interference and friendship of Harley, who introduced him to Queen Anne, by whom he was employed on several confidential missions, and more particularly in effecting the Union with Scotland. His personal obligations to Harley fettered his politics during the four last years of Queen Anne, and threw a cloud over his popularity in the following reign, but fixed no stain upon his character, except in the insinuations and slanders of his enemies, whether of his own or the opposite party. It was not till after he had retired from the battle, covered with scars and bruises, but without a single trophy or reward, in acknowledgment of his indefatigable and undeniable services in defence of the cause he had all his life espoused—when he was nearly sixty years of age, and



struck down by a fit of apoplexy—that he thought of commencing novel-writer, for his amusement and subsistence. The most popular of his novels, *Robinson Crusoe*, was published in the year 1719, and he poured others from his pen, for the remaining ten or twelve years of his life, as fast, and with as little apparent effort, as he had formerly done lampoons, reviews, and pamphlets.

We are in the number of those who, though we profess ourselves mightily edified and interested by the researches of biography, are not always equally gratified by the actual result. Few things, in an ordinary life, can come up to the interest which every reader of sensibility must take in the author of *Robinson Crusoe*. ‘Heaven lies about us in our infancy;’ and it cannot be denied, that the first perusal of that work makes a part of the illusion:—the roar of the waters is in our ears,—we start at the print of the foot in the sand, and hear the parrot repeat the well-known sounds of ‘Poor Robinson Crusoe! Who are you? Where do you come from; and where are you going?’—till the tears gush, and in recollection and feeling we become children again! One cannot understand how the author of this world of abstraction should have had any thing to do with the ordinary cares and business of life; or it almost seems that he should have been fed, like Elijah, by the ravens. What boots it then to know that he was a hose-factor, and the owner of a tile-kiln in Essex—that he stood in the pillory, was over head and ears in debt, and engaged in eternal literary and political squabbles? It is, however, well to be assured that he was a man of worth as well as genius; and that, though unfortunate, and having to contend all his life with vexations and disappointments, with vulgar clamour and the hand of power, yet he did nothing to leave a blot upon his name, or to make the world ashamed of the interest they must always feel for him. If there is nothing in a farther acquaintance with his writings to raise our admiration higher, (which could hardly happen without a miracle,) there is a great deal to enlarge the grounds of it, and to strengthen our esteem and confidence in him. To say nothing of the incessant war he waged with crying abuses, with priestcraft and tyranny, and the straight line of consistency and principle which he followed from the beginning to the end of his career,—he was a powerful though unpolished satirist in verse, (as his *True-born Englishman* sufficiently proves);—was master of an admirable prose style;—in his *Review*, (a periodical paper which was published three times a-week for nine years together,) led the way to that class of essay-writing, and those dramatic sketches of common life and manners, which were afterwards so happily

perfected by Steele and Addison;—in his *Essays on Trade*, anticipated many of those broad and liberal principles which are regarded as modern discoveries;—in his *Moral Essays*, and some of his *Novels*, undoubtedly set the example of that minute description and perplexing casuistry, of which Richardson so successfully availed himself;—was among the first to advocate the intellectual equality, and the necessity of improvements in the education of women;—suggested the project of *Saving Banks*, and an *Asylum for Idiots*;—among other notable services and claims to attention, by his thoughts on the best mode of watching and lighting the streets of the metropolis, might be considered as the author of the modern system of police;—and even in party matters, and the heats and rancorous differences of jarring sects, generally seized on that point of view which displayed most moderation and good sense, and in his favourite conclusions and arguments, was half a century before his contemporaries, who, for that reason, made common cause against him.

Defoe 'was too fond of the right to pursue the expedient,' and had much too dry, hard, and concentrated an understanding of the truth, to allow of any compromise with it from courtesy to the feelings or opinions of others. This kept him in perpetual hot water. It was a virtue, but carried to a repeated excess. It set the majority against him, and turned his dearest friends into his bitterest foes. If you make no concessions to the world, you must expect no favours from it. Our author's blindness and simplicity on this head, amount to the *dramatic*. He went on censuring and contradicting all sects and parties, setting them to rights, recommending peace to them, praying each to give up its darling prejudice and absurdity; and then he wonders that 'a man of peace and reason,' like himself, should be the butt of universal contumely and hatred. If an individual differs from you in common with others, you do not so much mind it—it is the act of a body, and implies no particular assumption of superior wisdom or virtue; but if he not only differs from you, but from his own *side* too, you then can endure the scandal no longer; but join to hunt him down as a prodigy of unheard-of insolence and presumption, and to get rid of him and his boasted honesty and independence together. While, therefore, the author of the *True-born Englishman*, *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*, and the *Legion Petition*, thought he was deserving well of God and his country, he was 'heaping coals of fire on his own head.' Nothing produces such antipathy in others as a total seeming want of sympathy with them. Defoe was urged on by a straight-forwardness and sturdiness of feeling, which

did not permit him to give up a single iota of his convictions; but it was 'stuff of the conscience' with him; there was nothing of spleen, malevolence, or the spirit of contradiction in his nature. Still, we consider him rather as an acute, zealous, and well-informed partisan, than as a general and dispassionate reasoner. He was a distinguished polemic, rather than a philosopher. Though he exercised his understanding powerfully and variously, yet it was always under the guidance of a certain banner—in support of 'a foregone conclusion.' He was too much in the heat of the battle—too constantly occupied in attacking or defending one side or the other, to consider fairly whether both might not be in the wrong. He asked himself, (as he was obliged to do in his own vindication,)—'Why am I in the right?' and gave admirable reasons for it, supposing it to be so; but he never thought of asking himself the farther question,—'Am I in the right or no?' This would have been entering on a new and unexplored tract, and might have led to no very welcome results. As an example of what we mean—Defoe, though a most strenuous and persevering advocate for the rights of conscience and toleration to those dissenters who, in his view, agreed with the church in the *essentials* of Christianity, was, notwithstanding, far from being disposed to extend the same indulgence to Socinians, Anabaptists, or other heretical persons. Of course, he would conceive that he, and those with whom he acted in concert, were not criminal in excluding others from the privilege in question; but he did not enlarge his views beyond this point, so as to change places with those who entirely differed with him; and in this respect fell short of the philosophical and liberal opinions of Locke, and even Toland, who placed toleration on the broad ground of a general principle, whatever exceptions might arise from particular circumstances, and urgent political expediency. We should, therefore, hardly be warranted in admitting Defoe into the class of perfectly free and unshackled speculative thinkers; though we certainly may rank him among the foremost of polemical writers for vigour, and ability of execution.

It will be easily conceived, that in the variety of subjects of which his author treated, and in the number and importance of the events in which he took part, either in person, or with his pen, Mr Wilson, whose industry and patience seem to have increased with the field he had to traverse, is at no loss for materials either for reflection or illustration. The only fault is, that the life of Defoe is sometimes lost in the history of the events of his time, like a petty current in the ocean. Neverthe-

less, the writer has traced these events and their causes so faithfully and clearly, and with such pertinent reflections, that we readily pass over this fault, and can forgive the slowness of a pencil that only *drags* from the weight of truth and good intention.

Mr Wilson has extracted from Defoe's *Review* (7. p. 296,) his account of the origin and application of the far-famed terms—Whig and Tory; and it is so curiously circumstantial, that we shall lay it before our readers, though some of them, no doubt, are already well acquainted with it.

‘The word Tory is Irish, and was first made use of there in the time of Queen Elizabeth’s wars in Ireland. It signified a kind of robber, who being listed in neither army, preyed in general upon the country, without distinction of English or Spaniard. In the Irish massacre, anno 1641, you had them in great numbers, assisting in every thing that was bloody and villainous; and particularly when humanity prevailed upon some of the Papists to preserve Protestant relations. These were such as chose to butcher brothers and sisters, fathers and mothers, the dearest friends and nearest relations; these were called *Tories*. In England, about the year 1680, a party of men appeared among us, who, though pretended Protestants, yet applied themselves to the ruin and destruction of their country. They began with ridiculing the Popish plot, and encouraging the Papists to revive it. They pursued their designs, in banishing the Duke of Monmouth and calling home the Duke of York; then in abhorring, petitioning, and opposing the bill of exclusion; in giving up charters, and the liberties of their country, to the arbitrary will of their prince; then in murdering patriots, persecuting dissenters, and at last, in setting up a Popish prince, on pretence of hereditary right, and tyranny on pretence of passive obedience. These men, for their criminal preying upon their country, and their cruel, bloody disposition, began to show themselves so like the Irish thieves and murderers aforesaid, that they quickly got the name of Tories. Their real god-father was Titus Oates, and the occasion of his giving them the name as follows—the author of this happened to be present: There was a meeting of some honest people in the city, upon the occasion of the discovery of some attempt to stifle the evidence of the witnesses [to the Popish plot], and tampering with Bedloe and Stephen Dugdale. Among the discourse, Mr Bedloe said, he had letters from Ireland, that there were some Tories to be brought over hither, who were privately to murder Dr Oates and the said Bedloe. The Doctor, whose zeal was very hot, could never after this hear any man talk against the plot, or against the witnesses, but he thought he was one of these Tories, and called almost every man a Tory that opposed him in discourse; till at last the word Tory became popular, and it stuck so close to the party in all their bloody proceedings, that they had no way to get it off; so at last they owned it, just as they do now the name of High-flyer.

‘As to the word *Whig*, it is Scotch. The use of it began there when the western men, called Cameronians, took arms frequently for their religion. Whig was a word used in those parts for a kind of liquor the Western Highlandmen used to drink, whose composition I do not re-

member,\* and so became common to the people who drank it. It afterwards became a denomination of the poor harassed people of that part of the country, who, being unmercifully persecuted by the government, against all law and justice, thought they had a civil right to their religious liberties, and therefore frequently resisted the arbitrary power of their princes. These men, tired with innumerable oppressions, ravishings, murders, and plunderings, took up arms about 1681, being the famous insurrection at Bothwell-bridge. The Duke of Monmouth, then in favour here, was sent against them by King Charles, and defeated them. At his return, instead of thanks for the good service, he found himself ill-treated for using them too mercifully; and Duke Lauderdale told King Charles with an oath, that the Duke had been so civil to Whigs, because he was a Whig himself in his heart. This made it a court-word; and in a little time, all the friends and followers of the Duke began to be called Whigs; and they, as the other party did by the word Tory, took it freely enough to themselves.'

The cruelties of this reign, and the sufferings of the people, for conscience and religion, on this and so many other occasions, formed a striking contrast to the voluptuous effeminacy and callous indifference of the court; and this insolent and pampered want of sympathy, by adding wanton insult to intolerable injury, undermined all respect for the throne in the minds of a numerous class of the community, and took away all pity for its fall in the succeeding reign. Charles, however, who seemed to oppress his subjects only for his amusement, and played the tyrant as an appendage to the character of the fine gentleman, did not proceed to extremities, or throw off the mask, whatever his secret wishes or designs might be, by openly attacking large masses of power and opinion. James was a true monk,—a blind, narrow, gloomy bigot; and did not stop short in his mad and obstinate career, till he drove the country to rebellion, and himself into exile. As the French wit said of him, seeing him coming out of a Popish chapel abroad, 'There goes a very honest gentleman, who gave up a kingdom for a mass.' By great good luck he succeeded, for it turned upon a nice point at last. On James's accession to the throne, addresses of loyalty and devotion poured in from all quarters, notwithstanding his well-known principles and designs. An address from the Middle Temple expressed the sentiments of that body of scholars and gentlemen, in a strain of fulsome servility. The University of Oxford promised to obey him 'without limitations or restrictions;' and the king's promise, in his speech from the throne, (says

---

\* 'It was the refuse, or what was called the *whig*, of the milk; and was applied,' says a Tory writer, 'to what was still more sour, a Scotch Presbyterian.'

Burnet,) passed for a thing so sacred, that those were looked upon as ill-bred who put into their address, 'our religion established by law, excepted.' The pulpits resounded with thanksgiving sermons, and the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance; and the clergy were forward in tendering the unconditional surrender of their rights and liberties for themselves, their fellow-subjects, and their posterity. If James did not before think himself *God's vicegerent upon earth*, he must have thought so now. But he no sooner took them at their word, and proceeded to appoint papists to be heads of colleges, and to induct them to protestant livings, and to send the bishops to the Tower for refusing to set their seal to his arbitrary mandates; that is, he no sooner alarmed the clergy for their authority spiritual, and their revenues temporal,—so that judgment began, as Dr Sherlock expressed it, in the house of God,—than they turned round, and sent their loyalty and their monarch a-packing together. Had it not been for this attack on the Church of England, the People of England might have been left to struggle with the hand of power and oppression how they could; and would have received plenty of reproofs and taunts from orthodox pulpits, on their refractory and unnatural behaviour in resisting lawful authority. Mr Wilson has quoted an eloquent passage from Defoe, in which he admirably exposes the indifference of the nation, at this period, to principles, and their short-sightedness as to consequences, till they actually arrived. We give the passage, both for the sense and style. It alludes to the favourers of the *Exclusion Bill*.

'How earnestly did those honest men, whose eyes God had opened to see the danger, labour to prevent the mischiefs of a Popish tyranny? How did they struggle in Parliament, and out of Parliament, to exclude a prince that did not mock them, but really promised them in as plain language as actions could speak, that he would be a tyrant; that he would erect arbitrary power upon the foot of our liberties, as soon as he had the reins in his hands? How were the opposers of this inundation oppressed by power, and borne down in the stream of it? And when they were massacred by that bloody generation, how did they warn us at their deaths of the mischiefs that were coming? Yet all this while, deaf as the adder to the voice of the charmer, stupid and hard as the nether millstone, we would not believe, nor put our hand to our deliverance, till that same Popery, that same tyranny, and that very party we struggled with, were sent to be our instructors; and then we learnt the lesson presently. Tyranny taught us the value of liberty; oppression, how to prize the fence of laws; and Popery showed us the danger of the Protestant religion. Then passive pulpits beat the ecclesiastical drum of war; absolute subjection took up arms; and obedience for conscience-sake resisted divine right. And who taught them this heterodox

lesson? Truly, the same schoolmaster they had hanged us for telling them of, the same dispensing power they had enacted, and the same tyranny they had murdered us for opposing.'

Defoe gives a very curious account of the insults offered to James II. after his fall, and of which he was an eye-witness.

'The king (after the Prince of Orange had entered London) had proceeded to the Kentish coast, and embarked on board a vessel with the intention of going to France; but being detained by the wind, Sir Edward Hales, one of his attendants, sent his footman to the post-office at Feversham, where his livery was recognised. Being traced to the vessel, it was immediately boarded by some people from the town, who, mistaking the king for a popish priest, searched his person, and took from him four hundred guineas, with some valuable seals and jewels. The rank of the individual treated with so much indignity was not long undiscovered; for, there being a constable present who happened to know him, he threw himself at his feet, and, begging him to forgive the rudeness of the mob, ordered restitution of what had been taken from him. The king, receiving the jewels and seals, distributed the money amongst them. After this, he was conducted to Feversham, where fresh insults were heaped upon fallen majesty.'—'While there, he found himself in the hands of the rabble, who, upon the noise of the king's being taken, thronged from all parts of the country to Feversham, so that the king found himself surrounded, as it were, with an army of furies; the whole street, which is very wide and large, being filled, and thousands of the noisy gentry got together. His majesty, who knew well enough the temper of the people at that time, but not what they might be pushed on to do at such a juncture, was very uneasy, and spoke to some of the gentlemen, who came with more respect, and more like themselves, to the town on that surprising occasion. The king told them he was in their hands, and was content to be so, and they might do what they pleased with him; but whatever they thought fit to do, he desired they would quiet the people, and not let him be delivered up to the rabble, to be torn in pieces. The gentlemen told his majesty they were sorry to see him used so ill, and would do any thing in their power to protect him; but that it was not possible to quell the tumult of the people. The king was distressed in the highest degree; the people shouting and pressing in a frightful manner to have the door opened. At length, his majesty observing a forward gentleman among the crowd, who ran from one party to another, hallooing and animating the people, the king sent to tell him he desired to speak with him. The message was delivered with all possible civility, and the little Masaniello was prevailed with to come up stairs. The king received him with a courtesy rather equal to his present circumstances than to his dignity; told him, what he was doing might have an event worse than he intended; that he seemed to be heating the people up for some mischief; and that as he had done him no personal wrong, why should he attack him in this manner? that he was in their hands, and they might do what they pleased; but he hoped they did not design to murder him. The fellow stood, as it were, thunderstruck, and said not one word. The king, proceeding, told him he

found he had some influence with the rabble, and desired he would pacify them; that messengers were gone to the parliament at London, and that he desired only they would be quiet till their return. What the fellow answered to the king I know not; but as I immediately enquired, they told me he did not say much, but this—"What can I do with them? and, what would you have me do?" But as soon as the king had done speaking, he turned short, and made to the door as fast as he could to go out of the room. As soon as he got fairly to the stair-head, and saw his way open, he turns short about to the gentlemen, to one of whom he had given the same churlish answer, and raising his voice, so that the king, who was in the next room, should be sure to hear him, he says, "*I have a bag of money as long as my arm, halloo, boys, halloo!*" The king was so filled with contempt and just indignation at the low-spirited insolence of the purse-proud wretch, that it quite took off the horror of the rabble, and only smiling, he sat down and said, "Let them alone, let them do their worst."

It seems the man was a retired grocer; and Defoe, in his *Complete Tradesman*, (says his biographer,) relates the circumstance, to show, that to be vain of mere wealth denotes a baseness of soul, and is often accompanied by a conduct unworthy of a rational creature.

In the midst of his distress, the King, it appears, had applied for protection to a clergyman, who treated him with cool indifference. The fact is thus noticed by Defoe:

'When the king was taken at Sheerness, and had fallen into the hands of the rabble, he applied himself to a clergyman who was there, in words to this effect: "Sir, it is men of your cloth who have reduced me to this condition; I desire you will use your endeavours to still and quiet the people, and disperse them, that I may be freed from this tumult." The gentleman's answer was cold and insignificant; and going down to the people, he returned no more to the king. Several of the gentry and clergy thereabouts,' adds our author, 'who had formerly preached and talked up this mad doctrine, (passive obedience,) never offered the king their assistance in that distress, which, as a man, whether prince or no, any one would have done: it therefore to me renders their integrity suspected, when they pretended to an absolute submission, and only meant that they expected it from their neighbours, whom they designed to oppress, but resolved never to practise the least part of it themselves, if ever it should look towards them.'

In another place, Defoe observes,

'I never was, I thank God for it, one of those that betrayed him, or any one else. I was never one that flattered him in his arbitrary proceedings, or made him believe I would bear oppression and injustice with a tame Issachar-like temper; those who did so, and then flew in his face, I believe, as much betrayed him as Judas did our Saviour; and their crime, whatever the Protestant interest gained by it, is no way lessened by the good that followed.'



The same spirit of integrity and candour, the same desire to see fair play, and to do justice to all parties,—in a word, the same spirit of common sense and common honesty which marks this passage, runs through all Defoe's writings; and as it raised him up a host of enemies among the abettors and abusers of power, so it left him neither friends nor shelter in his own party, to whose faults and errors he gave as little quarter; thinking himself bound to condemn them as freely and frankly. Hence he had a life of uneasiness,—an old age of pain. In reading the above description of James's situation, the hand is passed thoughtfully over the brow, and we for a moment forget the crimes of the monarch in the misfortunes of the man. It is laid down by Mr Burke, that none but mild, inoffensive princes, ever bring themselves to the condition of being objects of insult or pity to their subjects; and that tyrants, who deserve punishment, know well how to guard themselves against it, and 'to keep their seats firm.' Let us see how far this doctrine is made good in the case of James; or how far his own misdeeds brought their rare, but natural punishment upon his head. We will let Mr Wilson speak to this point:—

'The fate of James,' he says, 'would have been more entitled to pity, if he had not stained his character by so many acts of wanton and cold-blooded cruelty. That his merciless character was well known to the nation, appears by the intrepid retort of Colonel Ayloff, who had been condemned to death, but was advised by James to make some disclosures, it being in his power to pardon. "I know," says he, "it is in your power, but it is not in your nature, to pardon." That compassion was a total stranger to his breast, no one can doubt who reads the following affecting narrative: Monsieur Roussel, a French protestant divine of great learning and integrity, and minister of the Reformed Church at Montpellier in France, having witnessed the demolition of his own place of worship, soon after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, ventured, at the desire of his people, to preach in the night-time upon its ruins, and was attended by some thousands of his flock. For this offence he was condemned, by the intendant of Languedoc, to be broke upon the wheel; but, having withdrawn from the place, it was ordered that he should be hanged in effigy. After encountering numerous hazards, he succeeded in effecting his escape from France; and reaching Ireland, was chosen pastor of the French church in Dublin. James, who, for the sake of courting popularity, had formerly affected a charitable disposition towards the French refugees, threw off the mask when he landed in that country, and was surrounded by French counsellors. Being no longer under any temptation to disguise his natural temper and his hatred to the reformed religion, he committed one of those breaches of good faith which must for ever consign his name to infamy. For, instead of protecting a stranger who had been persecuted in his own country for a conscientious discharge of his religious duties, and had sought an asylum under the laws of another, where he had lived for some years in peaceable

exile, the base wretch delivered up this unoffending person to the French ambassador, Count D'Avaux, who sent him in chains to France, there to undergo the terrible punishment prepared for him by his inhuman murderers.\* Such an action requires no comment; nor can any term of reproach be too strong to designate the monster who could lend himself to its perpetration.

Yet many people, seeing the poor and forlorn figure which the exiled sovereign made with a few followers in the remote and silent court of St. Germain's, wanted to have him back; thinking that, to curtail him of the power to repeat such acts as that just related, and to deluge a country with blood, was the last degree of hardship, and a sad indignity offered to a king! Defoe was not in the number of these sentimentalists; and he had enough to do after his countrymen's 'courage had been screwed to the sticking-place,' to keep it there, and warn them against a relapse into Popery and slavery. One of his first publications had been an Address to the Dissenters, to caution them against accepting the terms of a general Toleration, which, on his accession to the throne, James II. had insidiously held out to all parties, and which was to include Papists as well as Dissenters. This was not a bait for Defoe's keen jealousy and strong repugnance to the encroachments of power to be taken in by. There was, however, some danger that the Dissenters, from their timidity and love of ease, and their being habitually too much engrossed by themselves and their own grievances, might be tempted to purchase the proffered grace at the price of allowing the Papists the same liberty; which was (at this period), under the barefaced pretence of liberality, and a tenderness for scrupulous consciences, to throw open the flood-gates of the most unbounded bigotry and intolerance. But the hatred and dread of Popery was, at this time, the ruling passion, in which the Dissenters shared in its utmost rancour and virulence; and this old grudge and hereditary antipathy had the effect of counteracting their natural coldness and phlegm, and a certain narrowness and formality in their views. Some of the weakest among them were, notwithstanding, for running into the snare, and did not easily forgive Defoe for pointing it out to them. The Marquis of Halifax had written a pamphlet on the same side of the question, called, 'A Letter to a Dissenter, upon occasion of his Majesty's late Declaration of Indulgence, 1687.' The title of Defoe's work is not now known. In speaking of it himself, some years after, he says,

'The next time I differed with my friends was when King James was

wheeling the Dissenters to take off the penal laws and test, which I could by no means come into. And as in the first I used to say, I had rather the Popish House of Austria should ruin the Protestants in Hungary than the infidel House of Ottoman should ruin both Protestant and Papist by overrunning Germany; so, in the other, I told the Dissenters I had rather the Church of England should pull our clothes off by fines and forfeitures, than that the Papists should fall both upon the Church and the Dissenters, and pull our skins off by fire and faggot.\*

The allusion in the foregoing passage is to an early Piece of Defoe's, (not reprinted among his tracts,) in which he had drawn his sword (for his weapon would be out) in defence of the Pope against the Turks. The occasion was this: The Hungarian Reformers having been persecuted and proscribed by the Austrian monarch, had risen in arms against him; and the Turks, availing themselves of the opportunity, had marched to their assistance, and laid siege to Vienna. Most of the English Protestants (as men think the nearest danger greatest, and hate their old enemies most,) were inclined to rejoice at this tumbling of a Popish despot, and the success of their Hungarian brethren. But Defoe, who saw farther than others, (and perhaps took a little pride in doing so,) viewed the matter in a different light, and deprecated the possible triumph of the Crescent over the Cross, and the subjugation of all Christendom, which might be the consequence. Logically speaking, he was right; but prudentially, he was perhaps wrong. The powers of Europe took the alarm as well as he, and combined to rescue the Austrian monarch from the gripe of the Mussulman. They succeeded; but could obtain no terms for the Hungarian peasants. Had the Emperor been left to fight his own battles against the Turks, he might have been frightened into measures of moderation and justice towards his own subjects; and there was, in the meantime, little probability of a Mahometan army overrunning Europe.

Defoe's first publication was a satirical pamphlet, called *Speculum Crape-gownorum*; intended to ridicule the fopperies and affectation of the younger clergy, as a set-off to some severe attacks on the mode of preaching among the Dissenters. This performance bears the date of 1682, when Defoe was only twenty-one, so that he commenced author very young. From that period he hardly ever ceased writing for the rest of his life; and a list of his works would alone fill a long article. The pasquinade just mentioned is attributed, by Mr Godwin, in his *Lives of*

---

\* Defoe's 'Appeal to Honour and Honesty.'

the *Philippes*, to John Philips ; but Mr Wilson gives it to Defoe, on his own authority ; and certainly his report is to be trusted, for he was a person of unchallengeable veracity. He was always a warm partisan of the Dissenters, (among whom he was born and bred,) and was ever ready to take up their quarrel either with wit or argument, for which he got small thanks. He was not, however, to be put off by their dulness or ingratitude. He was old enough to remember the times of their persecution and ' fiery ordeal ;' and it is at this source that the spirit of liberty is tempered and steeled to its keenest edge. Defoe's political firmness may, in part, also be traced to this union between the feelings of civil and religious liberty. An attachment to freedom, for the advantages it holds out to society, may be sometimes overruled by a calculation of prudence, or of the opposite advantages held out to the individual ; but a resistance to power for conscience-sake, and as a dictate of religious duty, rests on a positive ground, which is not to be shaken or tampered with, and has the seeds of permanence and martyrdom in it. What Mr Burke calls ' the *Hortus Siccus* of Dissent' is therefore the hot-bed of resistance to the encroachments of ambition ; and when, by long-continued struggles, the disqualifications of Dissenters are taken off, and the zeal which had been kept alive by hard usage and penal laws subsides into indifference or scepticism, we doubt whether there is any lever left, in mere public opinion, strong enough to throw off the pressure of unjust and ruinous power.

With these feelings, and, after the fears which he and all good men must have entertained for the safety of their religion, and the freedom of their country, it is not to be wondered at if Defoe hailed the arrival of the Prince of Orange with the greatest joy. He kept the anniversary of his landing, the 4th of November, all his life after. We find an account of him as one of those who went in procession with their Majesties to Guildhall, as a guard of honour, the year following. Oldmixon, who gives the account, has mixed up with it some of his unfounded prejudices against our author :

' Their Majesties,' he says, ' attended (Oct. 29, 1689,) by their royal highnesses the Prince and Princesses of Denmark, and by a numerous train of nobility and gentry, went first to a balcony, prepared for them at the Angel in Cheapside, to see the show ; which, for the great number of livery-men, the full appearance of the militia and artillery company, the rich adornments of the pageants, and the splendour and good order of the whole proceeding, out-did all that had been seen before upon that occasion ; and what deserved to be particularly mentioned, says a reverend historian, was a royal regiment of volunteer-horse, made up of

the chief citizens, who, being gallantly mounted and richly accoutred, were led by the Earl of Monmouth, now Earl of Peterborough, and attended their Majesties from Whitehall. Among these troopers, who were, for the most part, Dissenters, was Daniel Defoe, at that time a hosiier in Freeman's-yard, Cornhill; the same who afterwards was pilloried for writing an ironical invective against the Church; and did after that list in the service of Mr Robert Harley, and those brethren of his who broke the confederacy, and made a shameful and ruinous peace with France.\*

Oldmixon evidently singles out his brother author in this gallant procession with an eye of envy rather than friendship; and the invidious turn given to his politics only means, that all those were *black sheep* who did not go the absurd lengths of Oldmixon and his party in every thing.

The joy and exultation of Defoe on this great and glorious occasion was not of long duration, but was soon turned to gall and bitterness. 'Though that his joy was joy,' yet both friends and foes laboured hard to 'throw such changes of vexation on it, 'that it might lose all colour.' His admiration of King William was the ruling passion of his life. He was his hero, his deliverer, his friend: he was bound to him by the ties of patriotism, of religion, and of personal obligation. But this ruling passion was also the torment of his breast, because his well-grounded enthusiasm was not seconded by the unanimous public voice, and because the services of the great champion of liberty and of the Protestant cause did not meet with that glow of gratitude and affection in the minds of the people (when their immediate danger was blown over) that they richly merited. Defoe had not only ridden in procession with his Majesty, but he was afterwards closeted with him, and consulted by him on more than one question: so that his self-importance, as well as his sense of truth and justice, was implicated in the attacks which were made on the person and character of his royal patron and benefactor. Nothing can, in our opinion, exceed the good behaviour of William, nor the ill return he received from those he had been sent for, to deliver them from Popish bondage and darkness. Being no longer bowed to the earth by a yoke that they could not lift, and having got a king of their own choosing, they thought they could not exercise their new-acquired liberty and independence better than by using him as ill as possible, and reviling him for the very blessings which he had been the chief means of bestowing on them, and which his presence was absolutely necessary to continue to them. Having seen their hereditary, *passive-obedience* monarch, King James, quietly seated on the

---

\* Oldmixon's History of England, vol. iii. p. 36.

other side of the Channel, and being no longer in bodily fear of being executed as rebels, or burnt as heretics, the good people of England began to find a flaw in the title of the new-made monarch, because he was not, and did not pretend to be, absolute; and to sacrifice to the *manes* of divine right, by taking every opportunity, and resorting to every artifice to insult his person, to revile his reputation, to wound his feelings, and to cramp and thwart his measures for his own and their common safety. The Tories and high-fliers lamented that the crown was without its most precious jewel and ornament, *hereditary right*; and though they acknowledged the necessity of the case upon which they themselves had acted, yet they thought the time might come when this necessity might cease, and for their lawful King to be brought back again, 'with conditions.' Pulpits, long accustomed to unqualified submission, now echoed the double-tongued distinction of a king *de jure* and a king *de facto*. This party, whose old habits were inimical to the new order of things, but who made a virtue of necessity, tendered their allegiance to the Prince of Orange reluctantly and ungraciously; while the Non-jurors bearded him to his face. The Country Gentlemen, (at that time a formidable party, 'not pierceable by power of any 'argument,') only felt themselves at a loss from not having the Dissenters and Non-conformists to hunt down as usual. William they regarded as an interloper, who had no rights of his own, and who hindered other people from exercising theirs, in molesting and domineering over their neighbours. What made matters worse, was his being a foreigner; his Dutch origin was one of the things constantly thrown in his teeth, and that staggered the faith and loyalty of many of his well-meaning subjects, who could not comprehend the relation in which they stood to a sovereign of alien descent. The phrase, *True-born Englishman*, became a watchword in the mouths of the malecontent party; and at that name, (as often as it was repeated), the Whig and Protestant interest grew pale. It was to meet, and finally quell this charge, that Defoe penned his well-known poem of *The True-born Englishman*—a satire which, if written in doggerel verse, and without the wit or pleasantry of Butler's *Hudibras*, is a master-piece of good sense and just reflection, and shows a thorough knowledge both of English history and of the English character. It is indeed a complete and unanswerable exposure of the pretence set up to a purer and loftier origin than all the rest of the world, instead of our being a mixed race from all parts of Europe, settling down into one common name and people. Defoe's satire was so just and true, that it drove the cant, to which it was meant to be an antidote, out of fashion; and it

was this piece of service that procured the writer the good opinion and notice of King William. It did not, however, equally recommend him to the public. If it silenced the idle and ill-natured clamours of a party, by telling the plain truth,—that truth was not the more welcome for being plain or effectual. Though this handle was thus taken from malevolence and discontent, the tide of unpopularity had set in too strong from the first arrival of the king, not to continue and increase to the end of his reign; so that at last worn out with rendering the noblest services, and being repaid with the meanest ingratitude, he thought of retiring to Holland, and leaving his English crown of thorns to any one who chose to claim it.

The state of parties, at this period of our history, presents a riddle that has not been solved. It has been referred to the gloom and discontent of the English character; but other countries have of late exhibited the same problem, with the same results. It may be resolved into that propensity in human nature, through which, when it has got what it wants, it requires something else which it cannot have. The English people, at the period in question, wanted a contradiction,—that is, to have James and William on the throne together; but this they could not have, and so they were contented with neither. If they had recalled James, they would have sent him back again. They wanted him back again *with conditions*, and security for his future good behaviour. They wanted his title to the throne without his abuse of power; an absolute sovereign, with a reserve of the privileges of the people; a Popish prince, with a Protestant church; a deliverance from chains without a deliverer; and an escape from tyranny without the stain of resistance to it. They wanted not out of two things one which they could have, but a third, which was impossible; and as they could not have all, they were determined to be pleased with nothing. This greatly annoyed Defoe, who set his face against so absurd a manifestation of the spirit of the times. It embittered his satisfaction in the virtues of the sovereign, and the glories of his reign,—in his exploits abroad,—the moderation and justice of his administration at home; nor was he consoled for the malignity of his prince's enemies or the indifference of his friends, either by writing *Odes* on his battles and victories, or *Elegies* and *Epitaphs* on his death.

He was still less fortunate in following up the dictates of what he thought right, or in what he called 'speaking a word in season,' in the subsequent reign. Queen Anne, who succeeded to the crown on the death of King William, was placed

in no very graceful or dutiful position, as keeping her brother from the throne, which she occupied as the next Protestant heir, but to which, in the opinion of many, and perhaps in her own, he had a prior indefeasible right. She had been brought up with bigoted notions of religion; and in proportion as she felt the political ground infirm under her feet, she wished to stand well with the Church. There was, through her whole reign, therefore, a strong increasing bias to High Church principles. The promise of toleration to the dissenters soon sunk into an *indulgence*, and ended in the threat and the intention of putting in force the severest laws against them, under pretence that the Church was in danger. The Clergy sung the same song as the Queen, adding a burden of their own to it;—breathing nothing in their sermons but suspicion and hatred of the dissenters, reviving and inflaming old animosities, and encouraging their parishioners to proceed even to open violence against the frequenters of conventicles. Their services in bringing about the Revolution were forgotten; and nothing was insisted on but their share in the great Rebellion, and the beheading of Charles I. A university preacher (Sacheverell) talked of ‘hoisting the ‘bloody flag’ against the dissenters, and treated all those of the Moderate Party and Low Church as false brethren, who did not enlist under the banner. Another proposed shutting up not only the dissenters’ Meeting-Houses, but their Academies, and thus taking from them the education of their children. A third was for using gentle violence with the Queen to urge her to severe and salutary measures against Nonconformists; and considered her as under *duresse* in not being allowed to give full scope to the sentiments labouring in her bosom in favour of the Church of England. Defoe marked all this with quick and anxious eye; he saw the storm of persecution gathering, and ready to burst with tenfold vengeance, from its having been so long delayed; he thought it high time to warn his brethren of the impending mischief, and to point out to the government, in a terrible and palpable way, the dangerous and mad career to which the zealots of a party were urging them headlong. ‘So ‘should his anticipation prevent their discovery.’ He collected all the poisoned missiles and combustible materials he could lay his hands on, and putting them together in one heap, brought out his *Shortest Way with the Dissenters*. If it startled his adversaries and threw a blaze of light upon the subject, the explosion chiefly hurt himself. What beyond contradiction proved the truth of the satire was, that it was, at first, taken seriously by many of the opposite side, who thought it a well-timed and spirited Manifesto from a true son of the Church; and several young divines in the country, on perusing it, sent for more copies of it, with high



commendations, as the triumph of their views and party. Their rage, when they found out their mistake, was proportionable, and no treatment was bad enough for so vile an incendiary. The book was forthwith prosecuted by authority, as a malignant slander against the Church, and a seditious libel on the government. The author, as before noticed, was sentenced to the pillory, and to a heavy fine, with imprisonment during the queen's pleasure; which, as already mentioned, was the immediate and ultimate ruin of his affairs and prospects in life. Defoe bore his disgrace and misfortunes with the spirit of a man, and with a sort of grumbling patience peculiar to himself. He wrote on the occasion a *Hymn to the Pillory*, which contains some bad poetry and manly feeling; and indeed his apparent indifference is easily accounted for from a consciousness of the *flagrant* rectitude of his case. Pope has made an ungenerous allusion to the circumstances in the *Dunciad*:—

‘ See where on high stands unabash'd Defoe !’

Pope's imagination had too much effeminacy to stomach, under any circumstances, this kind of petty, squalid martyrdom; nor had he strength of public principle enough to form to himself the practical antithesis of ‘ dishonour honourable !’ The amiable in private life, the exalted in rank and station, alone fixed his sympathy, and engrossed his admiration. The exquisite compliments with which he has embalmed the memory of some of his illustrious friends, who stand ‘ condemned to everlasting ‘ fame,’ are a discredit to his own. His apostrophe to Harley, beginning,

‘ Oh soul supreme, in each hard instance tried,  
Above all pain, all passion, and all pride,’

contrasts strangely with the time-serving, vain, versatile, and unprincipled character of that minister; and Mr Wilson ought to have written a good book, for he has spoiled the effect of some of the finest lines in the English language. It was a bold step in Pope to put the author of *Robinson Crusoe* into the *Dunciad* at all; Swift also has a fling at him as ‘ the fellow that ‘ was pilloried;’ and Gay is equally sceptical and pedantic, as to his possessing more than ‘ the superficial parts of learning.’ We know of no excuse for the illiberality of the literary junto with regard to a man like Defoe, but that he returned the compliment to them; and in fact, if we were to take the character of men of genius from their judgment of each other, we must sometimes come to a very different conclusion from what the world have formed.

That Defoe should have incurred the hatred, and been consigned to the vengeance, of the High-Church party for thus honestly exposing their designs against the Dissenters, is but na-

tural; the wonderful part is, that he equally excited the indignation and reproaches of the Dissenters themselves; who disclaimed his work as a scandalous and inflammatory performance, and called loudly (in concert with their bitterest foes,) for the condign punishment of the author. "They almost with one voice, and as if seized with a contagion of folly, cried shame upon it, as an underhand and designing attempt to make a premature breach between them and the established church; to sow the seeds of groundless jealousy and ill-will; and to make them indirectly participators in, and the sufferers by, a scurrilous attack on the reverence due to religion and authority. Defoe was made the scapegoat of this paltry and cowardly policy, and was given up to the tender mercies of the opposite party without succour or sympathy. This extreme blindness to their own interests can only be explained by the consideration that the Dissenters, as a body, were at this time in a constant state of probation and suffering; they had enough to do with the evils they actually endured, without 'flying to others that they knew not of;' they stood in habitual awe and apprehension of their spiritual lords and masters;—would not be brought to suspect their further designs lest it should provoke them to realise their fears; and as they had not strength nor spirit to avert the blow, did not wish to see till they felt it. The alacrity and prowess of Defoe was a reproach to their backwardness; the truth of his appeal implied a challenge to meet it; and they answered, with the old excuse, 'why troublest thou us before our time?' The Dissenters too, at this period, were men of a formal and limited scope of mind, not much versed in the general march of human affairs; they required literal and positive proof for every thing, as well as for the points of faith on which they held out so manfully; and their obstinacy in maintaining these, and suffering for them, was matched by their timid circumspection and sluggish inpracticability with respect to every thing else. Their deserting Defoe, who marched on at the head of the battle,—pushed forward by his keen foresight and natural impatience of wrong,—is not out of character; though equally repugnant to sound policy or true spirit. They fixed a stigma on him, therefore, as a breeder of strife, a false prophet, and a dangerous member of the community; and, what is certainly inexcusable, when, afterwards, his jest was turned to melancholy earnest;—when every thing he had foretold was verified to the very letter; when the whole force of the government was arrayed against them, and Sacheverell in person unfurled 'his 'bloody flag,' and paraded the streets with a mob at his heels, pulling down their meeting-houses, burning their private dwellings, and making it unsafe for a Dissenter to walk the streets,—they did not take off the stigma they had affixed to the author

of *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*; did not allow that he was right and they were wrong, but kept up their unjust and illiberal prejudices, and even aggravated them in some instances, as if to prove that they were well-founded. Bodies of men seldom retract or atone for the injuries they have done to individuals. It will hardly seem credible to the modern reader, that in pursuance of this old sectarian grudge, and in conformity with the same narrow spirit, some years after this, when Queen Anne, who, from the death of her son, Prince George, had no hope of leaving an heir to the crown, turned her thoughts to the restoration of the Pretender, and when Defoe, in the general alarm and agitation which this uncertainty of the designs of the Court occasioned, endeavoured to ridicule and defeat the project, by pointing out, in his powerful and inimitable way, the incalculable benefits that would ensue from setting aside the Hanoverian succession, and bringing in the right line, one William Benson, (a Dissenter, a stanch friend to the House of Hanover, and the same who had a monument erected to Milton,) in his absurd prejudice against Defoe,—in his conviction that he was a renegade and a Marplot, and in his utter incapacity to conceive the meaning of irony,—actually set on foot a prosecution against the author as in league with the Pretender; wanted to have him accused of high treason, and obstinately persisted in, and returned to the charge; and that it was only through the friendly zeal and interest of Harley, and his representations to the queen, that he was pardoned and released from Newgate, whither he had been committed on the judges' warrant, for writing something in defence of his pamphlet, after its presentation by the Grand Jury, and his being compelled to give bail to appear for trial! 'The force of *dulness* could no farther go.'

Defoe had before this given violent offence to the Dissenters, by *dissenting* from and 'disobliging' them on a number of technical and doubtful points—a difference of which they seemed more tenacious than of the greatest affronts or deadliest injuries. Among others, he had opposed the principle of *occasional conformity*; that is, the liberty practised by some Dissenters, of going to church during their appointment to any public office, as they were prohibited from attending their own places of worship in their official costume. Nothing could be clearer, than that, if it was a point of conscience with these persons not to conform to the service of the established church, their being chosen mayor, sheriff, or alderman, did not give them a dispensation to that purpose. But many of the demure and purse-proud citizens of London, (among whom Mr William Benson was a leader and a shining light,) resented their not being supposed at liberty to appear at church in their gold chains and

robes of office, though contrary to their usual principles of non-conformity;—as children think they have a right to visit fine places in their new clothes on holidays. Their rage against Defoe was at its height, when he had nothing to say against Harley's Tory administration, for bringing in *The Occasional Conformity Bill*, to debar Dissenters of this puerile and contradictory privilege. It was to the kindness and generosity of Harley, on this as well as on former occasions, in affording our author pecuniary aid, of which he was in the utmost need, (being without means, friends, and in prison,) and in rescuing him from the grasp of his own party, that we owe his silence on political and public questions during the last years of Queen Anne; and a line of conduct that, in the present day, seems wavering and equivocal. His gratitude for private benefits hardly condemned him to withhold his opinions on public matters; but at that time, personal and private ties bore greater sway over general and public duties than is the case at present. We entirely acquit Defoe of dishonest or unworthy motives. He might easily have gone quite over to the other side, if he had been inclined to make a market of himself: but of this he never betrayed the remotest intention, and merely refused to join in the hue and cry against a man who had twice saved him from starving in a dungeon. Be this as it may, Defoe never recovered from the slur thus cast upon his political integrity, and was under a cloud, and discountenanced during the following reign; though the establishment of this very Protestant succession had been the object of the labours of his whole life, and was the wish that lay nearest his heart to his latest breath.

Defoe had, in the former reign, been at various times employed at her majesty's desire, and in her service, particularly in accomplishing the Union with Scotland in 1707. He displayed great activity and zeal in accommodating the differences of all parties; and his *History* of that event has been pronounced by good judges to be a masterpiece. But as to the numerous transactions in which he was concerned, and his various publications and controversies, we must refer the reader to Mr Wilson, who has furnished ample details and instructive comments. For ourselves, we must 'hold our hands and check our 'pride,' or we should never have done. Of all Defoe's multifarious effusions, the only one in which there is a want of candour and good faith, or in which he has wilfully blunted and deadened his *moral sense*, is his *Defence*, or (which is the same thing) his *Apology* for the Massacre of Glencoe. But King William was his idol, and he could no more see any faults in him than spots in the sun. Our old friend Daniel also tries us hard, when he rails at the poor servants, or 'fine madams,' as he calls

them, who get a little better clothes and higher wages when they come up to London, than they had in the country; when he runs *a-muck* at stage-plays, and the triumphs of the mimic scene;—confounding ‘Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, with Lucifer, Prince of Darkness.’ But these were the follies and prejudices of the time, aided by a little tincture of vulgarity, and the sourness of sectarian bigotry.

We pass on to his Novels, and are sorry that we must hasten over them. We owe them to the ill odour into which he had fallen as a politician. His fate with his party reminds one a little of the reception which the heroine of the *Heart of Mid-Lothian* met with from her sister, because she would not tell a lie for her; yet both were faithful and true to their cause. Being laid aside by the Whigs, as a suspected person, and not choosing to go over to the other side, he retired to Stoke-Newington, where, as already mentioned, he had an attack of apoplexy, which had nearly proved fatal to him. Recovering, however, and his activity of mind not suffering him to be idle, he turned his thoughts into a new channel, and, as if to change the scene entirely, set about writing Romances. The first work that could come under this title was *The Family Instructor*;—a sort of controversial narrative, in which an argument is held through three volumes, and a feverish interest is worked up to the most tragic height, on ‘the abominable nation’ (as it was at that time thought by many people, and among others by Defoe) of letting young people go to the play. The implied horror of dramatic exhibitions, in connexion with the dramatic effect of the work itself, leaves a curious impression. Defoe’s polemical talents are brought to bear to very good purpose in this performance, which was in the form of Letters; and it is curious to mark the eagerness with which his pen, after having been taken up for so many years with dry debates and doctrinal points, flies for relief to the details and incidents of private life. His mind was equally tenacious of facts and arguments, and fastened on each, in its turn, with the same strong and unremitting grasp. *Robinson Crusoe*, published in 1719, was the first of his performances in the acknowledged shape of a romance; and from this time he brought out one or two every year to the end of his life. As it was the first, it was decidedly the best; it gave full scope to his genius; and the subject mastered his prevailing bias to religious controversy, and the depravity of social life, by confining him to the unsophisticated views of nature and the human heart. His other works of fiction have not been read, (in comparison)—and one reason is, that many of them, at least, are hardly fit to be read, whatever may be said to the contrary. We shall go a little into the theory of this.

We do not think a person brought up and trammelled all his life in the strictest notions of religion and morality, and looking at the world, and all that was ordinarily passing in it, as little better than a contamination, is, *a priori*, the properest person to write novels: it is going out of his way—it is ‘meddling ‘with the unclean thing.’ Extremes meet, and all extremes are bad. According to our author’s overstrained Puritanical notions, there were but two choices, God or the Devil—Sinners and Saints—the Methodist meeting or the Brothel—the school of the press-yard of Newgate, or attendance on the refreshing ministry of some learned and pious dissenting Divine. As the smallest falling off from faith, or grace, or the most trifling peccadillo, was to be reprobated and punished with the utmost severity, no wonder that the worst turn was given to every thing; and that the imagination having once overstepped the formidable line, gave a loose to its habitual nervous dread, by indulging in the blackest and most frightful pictures of the corruptions incident to human nature. It was as well (in the cant phrase) ‘to be in for a sheep as a lamb,’ as it cost nothing more—the sin might at least be startling and uncommon; and hence we find, in this style of writing, nothing but an alternation of religious horrors and raptures, (though these are generally rare, as being a less tempting bait,) and the grossest scenes of vice and debauchery: we have either saintly, spotless purity, or all is rotten to the core. How else can we account for it, that all Defoe’s characters (with one or two exceptions for form’s sake) are of the worst and lowest description—the refuse of the prisons and the stews—thieves, prostitutes, vagabonds, and pirates—as if he wanted to make himself amends for the restraint under which he had laboured ‘all ‘the fore-end of his time’ as a moral and religious character, by acting over every excess of grossness and profligacy by proxy? How else can we comprehend that he should really think there was a salutary moral lesson couched under the history of *Moll Flanders*; or that his romance of *Roxana, or the Fortunate Mistress*, who rolls in wealth and pleasure from one end of the book to the other, and is quit for a little death-bed repentance and a few lip-deep professions of the vanity of worldly joys, showed, in a striking point of view, the advantages of virtue, and the disadvantages of vice? It cannot be said, however, that these works have an *immoral* tendency. The author has contrived to neutralise the question; and (as far as in him lay) made vice and virtue equally contemptible or revolting. In going through his pages, we are inclined to vary Mr Burke’s well-known paradox, that ‘vice, by losing all its ‘grossness, loses half its evil,’ and say that vice, by losing all its refinement, loses all its attraction. We have in them only the plea-

sure of sinning, and the dread of punishment here or hereafter ; —gross sensuality, and whining repentance. The morality is that of the inmates of a house of correction ; the piety, that of malefactors in the condemned hole. There is no sentiment, no atmosphere of imagination, no ‘purple light’ thrown round virtue or vice ;—all is either the physical gratification on the one hand, or a selfish calculation of consequences on the other. This is the necessary effect of allowing nothing to the frailty of human nature ;—of never strewing the flowers of fancy in the path of pleasure, but always looking that way with a sort of terror as to forbidden ground : nothing is left of the common and mixed enjoyments and pursuits of human life but the coarsest and criminal part ; and we have either a sour, cynical, sordid self-denial, or (in the despair of attaining this) a reckless and unqualified abandonment of all decency and character alike :—it is hard to say which is the most repulsive. Defoe runs equally into extremes in his male characters as in his heroines. *Captain Singleton* is a hardened, brutal desperado, without one redeeming trait, or almost human feeling ; and, in spite of what Mr Lamb says of his lonely musings and agonies of a conscience-stricken repentance, we find nothing of this in the text : the captain is always merry and well if there is any mischief going on ; and his only qualm is, after he has retired from his trade of plunder and murder on the high seas, and is afraid of being assassinated for his ill-gotten wealth, and does not know how to dispose of it. Defoe (whatever his intentions may be) is led, by the force of truth and circumstances, to give the Devil his due—he puts no gratuitous remorse into his adventurer’s mouth, nor spoils the *keeping* by expressing one relenting pang, any more than his hero would have done in reality. This is, indeed, the excellence of Defoe’s representations, that they are perfect *fac-similes* of the characters he chooses to portray ; but then they are too often the worst specimens he can collect out of the dregs and sink of human nature. *Colonel Jack* is another instance, with more pleasantries, and a common vein of humanity ; but still the author is flung into the same walk of flagrant vice and immorality ;—as if his mind was haunted by the entire opposition between grace and nature—and as if, out of the sphere of spiritual exercise and devout contemplation, the whole actual world was a necessary tissue of what was worthless and detestable.

We have, we hope, furnished a clue to this seeming contradiction between the character of the author and his works ; and must proceed to a conclusion. Of these novels we may, nevertheless, add, for the satisfaction of the inquisitive reader, that *Moll Flanders* is utterly vile and detestable : Mrs Flanders was ~~originally~~ born in sin. The best parts are the account of her

childhood, which is pretty and affecting; the fluctuation of her feelings between remorse and hardened impenitence in Newgate; and the incident of her leading off the horse from the inn-door, though she had no place to put it in after she had stolen it. This was carrying the love of thieving to an *ideal* pitch, and making it perfectly disinterested and mechanical. *Roxana* is better—soaring a higher flight, instead of grovelling always in the mire of poverty and distress; but she has neither refinement nor a heart; we are only dazzled with the outward ostentation of jewels, finery, and wealth. The scene where she dances in her Turkish dress before the king, and obtains the name of Roxana, is of the true romantic cast. The best parts of *Colonel Jack* are the early scenes, where there is a spirit of mirth and good fellowship thrown over the homely features of low and vicious life;—as where the hero and his companion are sitting at the three-halfpenny ordinary, and are delighted, even more than with their savoury fare, to hear the waiter cry, ‘Coming, gentlemen, coming,’ when they call for a cup of small-beer; and we rejoice when we are told as a notable event, that ‘about this time the Colonel took upon him to wear a shirt.’ The *Memoirs of a Cavalier* are an agreeable mixture of the style of history and fiction. These Memoirs, as is well known, imposed upon Lord Chatham as a true history. In his *History of Apparitions*, Defoe discovers a strong bias to a belief in the marvellous and preternatural; nor is this extraordinary, for, to say nothing of the general superstition of the times, his own impressions of whatever he chose to conceive are so vivid and literal, as almost to confound the distinction between reality and imagination. He could ‘call spirits from the vasty deep,’ and they ‘would come when he did call for them.’ We have not room for an enumeration of even half his works of fiction. We give the bust, and must refer to Mr Wilson for the whole length. After *Robinson Crusoe*, his *History of the Plague* is the finest of all his works. It has an epic grandeur, as well as heart-breaking familiarity, in its style and matter.

Notwithstanding the number and success of his publications, Defoe, we lament to add, had to struggle with pecuniary difficulties, heightened by domestic afflictions. To the last, when on the brink of death, he was on the verge of a jail; and the ingratitude and ill-behaviour of his son in embezzling some property which Defoe had made over for the benefit of his sisters and mother, completed his distress. He was supported in these painful circumstances by the assistance and advice of Mr Baker, who had married his youngest daughter, Sophia. The subjoined letter gives a melancholy but very striking picture of the state of his feelings at this sad juncture:—



DEAR MR BAKER,

'I have yo<sup>r</sup> very kind and affecc'onate Letter of the 1st: But not come to my hand till y<sup>e</sup> 10th; where it had been delay'd I kno' not. As your kind manner, and kinder Thought, from w<sup>ch</sup> it flows, (for I take all you say to be as I always believed you to be, sincere and Nathaniel like, without Guile) was a particular satisfacc'on to me; so the stop of a Letter, however it happened, deprived me of that cordial too many days, considering how much I stood in need of it, to support a mind sinking under the weight of an afflicc'on too heavy for my strength, and looking on myself as abandoned of every Comfort, every Friend, and every Relative, except such only as are able to give me no assistance.

'I was sorry you should say at y<sup>e</sup> beginning of your Letter, you were debarred seeing me. Depend upon my sincerity for this, I am far from debarring you. On y<sup>e</sup> contrary, it would be a greater comfort to me than any I now enjoy, that I could have yo<sup>r</sup> agreeable visits w<sup>th</sup> safety, and could see both you and my dearest Sophia, could it be without giving her y<sup>e</sup> grief of seeing her father *in tenebris*, and under y<sup>e</sup> load of insupportable sorrows. I am sorry I must open my griefs so far as to tell her, it is not y<sup>e</sup> blow I rec<sup>d</sup> from a wicked, perjurd, and contemptible enemy, that has broken in upon my spirit, w<sup>ch</sup> as she well knows, has carryed me on thro' greater disasters than these. But it has been the injustice, unkindness, and, I must say, inhuman dealing of my own son, w<sup>ch</sup> has both ruined my family, and, in a word, has broken my heart; and as I am at this time under a weight of very heavy illness, w<sup>ch</sup> I think will be a fever, I take this occasion to vent my grief in y<sup>e</sup> breasts who I know will make a prudent use of it, and tell you, that nothing but this has conquered, or could conquer me. *El tu! Brute!* I depended upon him, I trusted him, I gave up my two dear unprovided children into his hands; but he has no compassion, and suffers them and their poor dying mother to beg their bread at his door, and to crave, as if it were an alms, what he is bound under hand and seal, besides the most sacred promises, to supply them with; himself, at y<sup>e</sup> same time, living in a profusion of plenty. It is too much for me. Excuse my infirmity, I can say no more; my heart is too full. I only ask one thing of you as a dying request. Stand by them when I am gone, and let them not be wrong'd, while he is able to do them right. Stand by them as a brother; and if you have any thing within you owing to my memory, who have bestow'd on you the best gift I had to give, let y<sup>m</sup> not be injured and trampled on by false pretences, and unnatural reflections. I hope they will want no help but that of comfort and council; but that they will indeed want, being too easie to be manag'd by words and promises.

'It adds to my grief that it is so difficult to me to see you. I am at a distance from Lond<sup>n</sup> in Kent; nor have I a lodging in London, nor have I been at that place in the Old Bailey, since I wrote you I was removed from it. At present I am weak, having had some fits of a fever that have left me low. But those things much more.

'I have not seen son or daughter, wife or child, many weeks, and kno' not which way to see them. They dare not come by water, and by land here is no coach, and I kno' not what to do.

'It is not possible for me to come to Enfield, unless you could find a retired lodging for me, where I might not be known, and might have

the comfort of seeing you both now and then ; upon such a circumstance, I could gladly give the days to solitude, to have the comfort of half an-hour now and then, with you both, for two or three weeks. But just to come and look at you, and retire immediately, tis a burden too heavy. The parting will be a price beyond the enjoyment.

‘ I would say, (I hope) with comfort, that ’tis yet well. I am so near my journey’s end, and am hastening to the place where y<sup>e</sup> weary are at rest, and where the wicked cease to trouble ; be it that the passage is rough, and the day stormy, by what way soever He please to bring me to the end of it, I desire to finish life with this temper of soul in all cases : *Te Deum Laudamus*.

‘ I congratulate you on y<sup>e</sup> occasion of yo<sup>r</sup> happy advance in y<sup>r</sup> employment. May all you do be prosperous, and all you meet with pleasant, and may you both escape the tortures and troubles of uneasy life. May you sail y<sup>e</sup> dangerous voyage of life with a *forcing wind*, and make the port of heaven *without a storm*.

‘ It adds to my grief that I must never see the pledge of your mutual love, my little grandson. Give him my blessing, and may he be to you both your joy in youth, and your comfort in age, and never add a sigh to your sorrow. But, alas ! that is not to be expected. Kiss my dear Sophy once more for me ; and if I must see her no more, tell her this is from a father that loved her above all his comforts, to his last breath.

‘ Yo<sup>r</sup> unhappy, D. F.

‘ About two miles from Greenwich, Kent,

‘ *Tuesday, August 12, 1730.*’

‘ From this scene of sorrow,’ says Mr Wilson, ‘ we must now hasten to an event, that dropped before it the dark curtain of time. Having received a wound that was incurable, there is too much reason to fear that the anguish arising from it sunk deep in his spirits, and hastened the crisis that, in a few months, brought his troubles to a final close. The time of his death has been variously stated ; but it took place upon the 24th of April, 1731, when he was about seventy years of age, having been born in the year 1661. Cibber and others state that he died at his house at Islington ; but this is incorrect. The parish of St Giles, Cripplegate, in which he drew his first breath, was also destined to receive his last. This we learn from the parish register, which has been searched for the purpose ; and farther informs us, that he went off in a lethargy. He was buried from thence, upon the 26th of April, in Tindall’s Burying-ground, now most known by the name of Bunhill-Fields. The entry in the register, written probably by some ignorant person, who made a strange blunder of his name, is as follows : “ 1731. April 26. Mr Dubow. Cripplegate.” His wife did not long survive him.’

ART. VI.—*Case of the Sugar Duties; with Proofs and Illustrations.* Pp. 97. Lond. 1829.

WE are not aware that there are any authentic accounts with respect to the precise period when sugar first began to be used in England. It was, however, imported in small quantities by the Venetians and Genoese in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries;\* but honey was then, and long after, the principal ingredient employed in sweetening liquors and dishes. Even in the early part of the seventeenth century, the quantity of sugar imported was very inconsiderable; and it was made use of only in the houses of the rich and great. It was not till the latter part of the century, when coffee and tea began to be introduced, that sugar came into general demand. In 1700, the quantity consumed was about 10,000 tons, or 22,000,000 lbs.; at this moment the consumption has increased to the prodigious extent of 160,000 tons, or about 360,000,000 lbs.; so that sugar forms not only one of the principal articles of importation and sources of revenue, but an important necessary of life.

Great, however, as the increase in the use of sugar has certainly been, it may, we think, be easily shown, that the demand for it is still very far below its natural limit; and that, were the existing duties on this article reduced, and the trade placed on a proper footing, its consumption, and the revenue derived from it, would be greatly increased. A subject of this sort has at all times, but particularly in the present situation of the country, peculiar claims on the public attention. It is confessedly, indeed, one of the highest importance; and as it will certainly be discussed during the ensuing session of Parliament, we embrace this opportunity to submit a few remarks with respect to it.

During the first half of last century, the consumption of sugar increased five fold. It amounted, as already stated—

In 1700 . . to . .	10,000 tons, . . . .	or 22,000,000 lbs.
1710 . . . . .	14,000 . . . . .	31,360,000
1734 . . . . .	42,000 . . . . .	94,080,000
1754 . . . . .	53,270 . . . . .	119,320,000
1770 to 1775, 72,500 (average) . .		162,500,000
1786 . 1790, 81,000 . . . . .		181,500,000

---

\* In Marin's *Storia del Commercio de' Veneziani*, (v. p. 306,) there is an account of a shipment made at Venice for England in 1319, of 100,000 lbs. of sugar, and 10,000 lbs. of sugar candy. The sugar is said to have been brought from the Levant.

In the reign of Queen Anne the duty on sugar amounted to 3s. 5d. per cwt. Small additions were made to it in the reign of George II.; but in 1780 it was only 6s. 8d. In 1781 a considerable addition was made to the previous duty; and in 1787 it was as high as 12s. 4d. In 1791 it was raised to 15s.; and while its extensive and increasing consumption pointed it out as an article well fitted to augment the public revenue, the pressure on the public finances, caused by the French war, occasioned its being loaded with duties, which, though they yield a large return, would, there is good reason to think, have been more productive had they been lower. In 1797 the duty was raised to 17s. 6d.; two years after, it was raised to 20s.; and, by successive augmentations in 1803, 1804, and 1806, it was raised to 30s.; but in the last mentioned year it was enacted, that, in the event of the market-price of sugar in bond, or exclusive of the duty, being, for the four months previous to the 5th January, the 5th May, or the 5th September, below 49s. a cwt., the Lords of the Treasury might remit 1s. a cwt. of the duty; that if the prices were below 48s. they might remit 2s.; and if below 47s. they might remit 3s., which was the greatest reduction that could be made. In 1826, the duty was declared to be constant at 27s., without regard to price.

The duty on foreign sugars is a prohibitory one of 63s. a cwt. The duty on East India sugar is 37s., or 10s. more than the duty on West India sugar. Sugar from the Mauritius, is however, by a special provision, allowed to be imported at the low duty.

At present, the revenue derived from sugar and melasses in Great Britain and Ireland, may be estimated at about L.5,000,000. Thus—

160,000 tons of sugar consumed in Great Britain, at 27s. a cwt.	L.4,320,000
16,000 tons consumed in Ireland, at ditto	430,000
20,000 tons melasses, at L.10 per ton, (converted into a coarse sugar, <i>bastards</i> , and treacle) *	200,000
	<hr/> L.4,950,000

---

\* Previously to the late non-intercourse between the British West Indies and the United States, melasses were chiefly exported to the latter, for distillation into rum.

*The following is an official Account of the Quantities of Sugar retained for Home Consumption, the Nett Revenue derived from it, and the Rates of Duty with which it was charged from 1789 to 1828, both inclusive.*

SUGARS CONSUMED IN GREAT BRITAIN.							
Years.	Quantities retained for Home Consumption.	Nett Revenue.			Rates of Duty.		
					British Plantation Sugar.	East India Sugar.	
	Cwt.	£	s.	d.	Per cwt. £ s. d.	Per cwt. £ s. d.	Per cent ad valorem. £ s. d.
1789	1,547,109	862,632	11	11	0 12 4		37 16 3
1790	1,586,232	908,954	17	4			
1791	1,403,211	1,074,903	16	5	0 15 0	0 2 8	37 16 3
1792	1,361,592	1,012,538	12	1			
1793	1,677,097	1,316,502	14	3			
1794	1,489,392	1,031,492	4	2			
1795	1,336,230	949,961	16	1			
1796	1,554,062	1,225,213	7	5			
1797	1,273,722	1,299,744	0	7	0 17 6	0 5 2	37 16 3
1798	1,476,552	1,794,990	15	9	0 19 0	0 5 2	40 16 3
1799	2,772,438	2,321,935	16	5	1 0 0	0 2 6	42 16 3
1800	1,506,921	1,835,112	11	1			
1801	2,773,795	2,782,232	18	1		0 3 2	42 16 3
1802	2,250,311	2,210,801	6	11			
1803	1,492,565	1,551,457	17	11	1 4 0	1 6 4 <sup>3</sup>	1 4 0
1804	2,144,369	2,458,124	18	3	1 6 6	1 9 1 <sup>4</sup>	1 6 6
1805	2,076,103	2,439,795	1	10	1 7 0	1 9 8 <sup>3</sup>	1 7 0
1806	2,801,747	3,097,590	3	6			
1807	2,277,665	3,150,753	6	3			
1808	2,842,813	4,177,916	3	4			
1809	2,504,507	3,273,995	2	3		1 10 0	1 0 0
1810	3,489,312	3,117,330	12	9	1 9 0	1 12 0	1 0 0
1811	3,226,757	3,339,218	4	3	1 8 0	1 11 0	1 0 0
1812	2,604,019	3,939,939	17	2	1 7 0	1 10 0	1 0 0
1813	2,209,063	3,447,560	4	5	1 10 0	1 13 0	1 0 0
1814	1,997,999	3,276,513	6	5		Per Cwt. £1 10 1 11 1 19 1 10 1 17 1 19 2 0 1 17 1 17	
1815	1,888,965	2,957,403	2	4		1 10 0	2 0
1816	2,228,156	3,166,851	18	0	1 7 0	1 17 1 17 1 18 1 17 1 17	
1817	2,960,794	3,967,154	5	0		2 0	
1818	1,457,707	2,331,472	3	5	1 10 0	1 18	
1819	2,474,738	3,507,844	11	0	1 8 0 1 7 0 1 7 0	1 17 1 17	
1820	2,581,256	3,477,770	11	4			
1821	2,676,274	3,660,567	6	7			
1822	2,618,490	3,579,412	12	1			
1823	2,842,676	4,022,782	4	1			
1824	2,957,261	4,223,240	18	5			
1825	2,655,959	3,756,654	0	1			
1826	3,255,075	4,518,690	15	9			
1827	3,021,191	4,218,623	6	7			
1828	3,285,843	4,576,287	13	4			

\* Sugar used in the distilleries included in these years.

† Previously to 1820, the importation of East India sugar was comparatively trifling, and does not at this moment amount to above 190,000 cwt. The imports from the Mauritius have increased rapidly during the last five years, more especially since 1826, when the duty on Mauritius sugar was reduced to the same level as that on West India sugar. They now exceed 200,000 cwt.

The price of sugar, exclusive of the duty, may be taken, at an average of the last few years, at from 30s. to 35s.\* But to lay a tax of 27s. on a necessary of life, which costs only 30s. or 35s. is obviously a most oppressive proceeding. Indeed, there does not seem to be the shadow of a doubt, that the consumption, and consequently also the revenue, would be very greatly increased by reducing the duty to 18s. or 20s. This may be confidently inferred from the increase of consumption that has invariably followed every fall in the price of sugar. In 1817, for example, the price of sugar to the consumer, duty included, was 74s. 6d.; the quantity entered for home consumption amounting to 2,960,794 cwts. In 1818 the price rose to 80s. 6d., and the quantity consumed fell to 1,457,707 cwts.; being a reduction of fully half the quantity consumed in the previous year. In 1819, the price again fell, duty included, to 69s., and the consumption immediately rose to 2,474,738 cwts. These facts strikingly evince the powerful effect of a rise of price in lessening, and of a fall in extending, consumption. There can be no question, indeed, that the increased consumption of sugar during the last three years has been mainly owing to its low price. In 1824, for example, the average price of sugar, exclusive of the duty, was under 32s., and the quantity consumed was 2,957,281 cwts. But in 1825, prices rose during the mania of that year to above 40s., and the consumption sunk to 2,655,959 cwts. It rose with the fall of prices in 1826 to 3,255,075 cwts.; but, in consequence of a rise of from 12 to 20 per cent in 1827, it declined to 3,021,191 cwts., and again rose with a fresh fall in 1828 to 3,285,843 cwts.

And yet, singular as it may seem, statements similar to those now laid before the reader were referred to (Debate on Mr Grant's motion, 25th May, 1829,) by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to prove the *little effect* that any practicable reduction of the duty would have in extending the consumption of sugar! The Right Honourable Gentleman really seems to be, in this instance, not a little unreasonable. He is reported (*Mirror of Parliament*, No. 40, p. 1852) to have said, 'In 1815, the average price of sugar to the consumer was 91s. 10d. a cwt., including the duty, and it is at present 58s. 8d. Here we have a reduction of 33s. a cwt., and yet the difference between these prices has not produced *a very increased consumption.*' What Mr Goulbourn means by 'a very increased consumption,' we are

---

\* The price is at present only 41s., duty included; but this is a depression that cannot possibly continue.

at a loss to conjecture. But if our readers will refer to the foregoing *official* table, they will find, that the quantity of sugar retained for home consumption in 1815, when the price was 91s. 10d., was 1,888,965 cwts.; and that the quantity consumed in 1828, when the price had sunk to 58s. 8d., was 3,285,843 cwts.; being an increase of no less than 1,396,878 cwts., or 156,450,336 lbs.;—that is, nearly *fifty* per cent of the whole sugar consumed in Great Britain, exclusive of bastards. Now, we must say, notwithstanding the contrary opinion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that we cannot help looking upon this as a very great, and, indeed, extraordinary increase; and as furnishing an incontrovertible demonstration of the powerful influence of low prices, and consequently low duties, in extending consumption.

It should also be observed, in estimating the probable effects of a reduction of the duty on consumption, that the prices of sugars, for the four years ending with 1818, fluctuated from 80s. to 100s.; whereas they are now sunk to from 50s. to 60s.; so that the same diminution of duty that would formerly have occasioned a reduction of 10 per cent only in the price of sugar, would now occasion a reduction of nearly 20 per cent; and would thus, by bringing additional quantities within reach of an infinitely larger class of consumers, extend the demand in a corresponding proportion.

Notwithstanding the increased consumption of sugar that has taken place during the last three years, in consequence of the low prices, it is still inferior to what it was at the beginning of the century, allowing for the increase of population. The sugar consumed, at an average of the years 1801 and 1802, was 2,512,053 cwts. But the population, which was under eleven millions in 1801, is now certainly not under 16 millions, or has increased in the ratio of rather more than 45 per cent. And, had the consumption of sugar increased in the same proportion, it should now have amounted to 3,642,476 cwts.; whereas, at an average of the last two years, it amounts to only 3,153,517 cwts.; having fallen off, as compared with the population, nearly 500,000 cwts., or 56,000,000 lbs.

It is clear, however, that, but for the oppressiveness of the duty, and the exclusion of foreign sugar, this result would not have taken place. The proportion which the middle and upper classes bear to the whole population has been vastly increased since 1801. A very great increase has also taken place in the consumption of tea and coffee, home-made wines, preserved fruits, &c.,—all of which occasion the consumption of large quantities of sugar; so that, instead of having declined, as compared with the population, the fair inference is, that had it been sup-

plied under a more liberal system, it would have increased in a much greater degree than it has done.

The quantity of sugar at present consumed in Great Britain may, as already stated, be estimated at 160,000 tons, or about 360,000,000 lbs.; which, taking the population at 16 millions, gives, at an average,  $22\frac{1}{2}$  lbs. for each individual. Now this, though a far larger average than that of France or any of the Continental States, is small, compared with what it might be, were the duties reduced, and an opening made for foreign sugars to come into our markets. In workhouses, the customary annual allowance for each individual, is, we believe, 34 lbs.; and in private families, the smallest separate allowance for domestics, is 1 lb. a-week, or 52 lbs. a-year. Taking these facts into view, it does not seem at all unreasonable, considering the extent to which tea and coffee are now used in this country, and the growing demand for them, and considering also the vast quantities of sugar required in the preparation of fruits,—to hold, that if the duties were reduced to the extent proposed, and the trade placed on a proper footing, the consumption would in a few years be doubled;—that is, increased from 160,000 to 320,000 tons: And, while this quantity, at 18s. a cwt., would yield a much larger direct revenue than is at present derived from the duty of 27s., it would also be productive, not only of a great increase of enjoyment to the consumers, but of an immense extension of commerce and navigation.

But the truth is, that we should very much underrate the probable increase, were we to estimate it at only double over the whole empire. The consumption of sugar in Ireland does not exceed 16,000 tons, or about 36,000,000 lbs.; which, as there are at least *eight* millions of inhabitants in that country, gives an average of no more than  $4\frac{1}{4}$  lb. to each, or *one-fifth* part only of the average quantity consumed by each individual in Great Britain. So singular a result must, we believe, be ascribed, in a considerable degree, to the comparative poverty of the Irish; but there can be no doubt that it is, partly at least, if not principally, owing to over taxation. The average consumption of sugar in Ireland, in 1800 and 1803, when the duty was about 20s. amounted to 571,000 cwts., or 63,752,000 lbs. But at an average of the four years ending with 1820, when the duty was as high as 30s, the consumption was only 266,000 cwts.; or *less than half* what it had been at the former period, notwithstanding the vast increase of population during the interval. And, at this moment, when Ireland has from three to four millions of in-



habitants more than in 1800, she does not consume much above *half* the quantity of sugar she did then. Do not these facts establish, beyond all question, that the duties on sugar in Ireland have been carried to a ruinous extent?—to such an extent as to render them destructive alike of the comforts of the people, and of the augmentation of the revenue? At present, the Irish duties are, in effect, prohibitory; and might be thought to have been imposed, not for the sake of revenue, but to debar the people from the use of sugar, that they might be the better able to buy whisky, and contribute to the Catholic rent! At all events, it is now clear as demonstration, that if the duty was imposed for the sake of revenue, its oppressiveness has totally defeated its object; and that, to make it productive, it must be effectually reduced. Generally speaking, we are averse to making any distinctions in the duties in different parts of the empire; but in the peculiar circumstances under which Ireland is placed, we think, that the duty on the sugar consumed there might be advantageously reduced to 10s. or 12s.; allowing it to increase by 1s. a-year, until it rose to 18s. or 20s., the level at which the duty in this country should be fixed. Were a plan of this sort adopted, we have no doubt whatever, that in the course of half-a-dozen years, the consumption of sugar in Ireland would be *quintupled*; whilst the revenue, instead of losing, would be doubled or trebled.

But, independently altogether of any considerations with respect to revenue, there are other grounds which afford a still better vindication of the policy of the measure now proposed. The ‘one thing needful’ in Ireland is to inspire the population with a taste for the conveniences and enjoyments of civilized life; but, how is it possible to do this while these conveniences are burdened with oppressive duties, that form an insuperable obstacle to their being used by any but the richest classes? Hence, the first step towards supplying what is confessedly the grand desideratum in the case of Ireland, is to reduce the duties on articles of convenience and luxury, so that they may become attainable by the mass of the people. If this be done, we may rest assured that the desire inherent in all individuals of improving their condition will impel them to exert themselves to obtain them. A taste for the articles in question will be gradually diffused amongst all ranks, and ultimately, it will be thought discreditable to be without them.

It may be said, perhaps, that the reduction of the duties on sugar in Ireland to 10s. or 12s., while the duty in Great Britain is 18s., would occasion its being smuggled from the former into

the latter. But we do not attach much weight to this statement. The same sort of machinery which serves to prevent whisky from being smuggled from Ireland, might serve to prevent the smuggling of sugar; and, though a few thousand cwts. were clandestinely imported, it would be of no consequence. Neither do we propose that the difference in the rates of duty should be permanent. The immediate reduction of the duty on sugar consumed in Ireland to the extent we have suggested, would occasion such a reduction in its price, as would give a decisive stimulus to its consumption; and the duty might then be gradually raised to the same level as in England, or to such a level as would not afford any temptation to smuggle.

The results that have followed the reduction of oppressive duties on other articles, afford the best evidence to prove that we have not overrated the effects that would follow from reducing the duties on sugar. For example, in 1807, the duty on coffee was 1s. 8d. a pound; and the quantity entered for home consumption amounted to 1,170,164 lbs., yielding a revenue of L.161,245. In 1808, the duty was reduced from 1s. 8d. to 7d., and in 1809, there were no fewer than 9,251,837 lbs. entered for home consumption; yielding, notwithstanding the reduction of the duty, a revenue of L.245,856. The duty having been raised in 1819 from 7d. to 1s. a pound, the quantity entered for home consumption in 1824 was 7,993,041 lbs., yielding a revenue of L.407,544. In 1824, however, the duty being again reduced from 1s. to 6d., the quantity entered for home consumption in 1825 was 10,766,112 lbs.; and in 1828, it had increased to 16,522,422 lbs., yielding a nett revenue of L.425,389.

Other and no less striking instances may be produced to show the superior productiveness of low duties; or of such duties as allow a taxed article to be freely consumed by the bulk of the people. In Ireland, for example, the duty on spirits in 1821 and 1822 was 5s. 6d. the Irish gallon, the consumption being, at an average of these two years, 2,488,778 gallons, yielding a nett revenue of L.854,903. In 1823, the duty was reduced from 5s. 6d. to 2s. the Irish gallon, or 2s. 10d. the Imperial gallon; and in 1825, the consumption rose to 9,262,744 gallons, and the revenue to L.1,084,191. In 1828, the consumption was very near 10,000,000 gallons, yielding a nett revenue of L.1,395,722. And it is of importance to observe, that this immense increase has not been the result, as many suppose, of any absolute increase in the consumption of spirits; but of the almost total suppression of illicit distillation and smuggling, and of the crimes and enormities consequent upon such practices. Precisely similar effects have followed from the reduction of the

duties on Scotch whisky, and on French and other wines. Let us, therefore, hear no more of the necessity of keeping up oppressive duties on sugar, or any other article, for the sake of revenue, when it is clear as the sun at noon-day, that the revenue would be greatly increased by their reduction.

But, anxious as we are for the reduction of the duties on sugar, we should object decidedly to any such measure, unless it were of a general description; or unless the duty on *foreign* sugars were reduced to nearly the same level as that on British sugars. The sugars produced in the British West Indies, (including Demerara and Berbice) and the Mauritius, may be estimated at 192,000 tons; and as the consumption of Great Britain and Ireland is about 176,000 tons, the excess is only 16,000 tons; the principal part of which is forced abroad by means of the bounty,—or, as it is falsely called, drawback, on the exportation of refined sugar. If, therefore, the duty on British sugars were reduced to 18s. or 20s., without any reduction being made of the prohibitory duties on foreign sugars, the consequence would be, that the price of the former would very soon rise, because of the increased demand, either to the present or a higher level; and, that the planters, and not the public, would reap the whole benefit of the reduction. Hence it is indispensable, in order that the effects that would infallibly result under a free system, from a reduction of the duty, may not be defeated by the monopoly of the planters, that the duty on foreign sugars should be such that they may easily find their way into our markets, whenever prices become a little higher than usual. According to the Resolutions submitted to the House of Commons last session by Mr Grant, the duties on British plantation and Mauritius sugar were fixed at 20s., those on East India sugar at 25s., and those on foreign sugar at 28s. a cwt. We think it would be a material improvement were 2s. deducted from each of these rates, making them respectively 18s., 23s., and 26s. But at whatever sum we may fix the duty on British plantation sugar, we shall only make bad worse, if we do not reduce the duty on foreign sugar, in at least the proportion proposed by Mr Grant. It is far better if the public is to be compelled to pay an oppressively high price for an article so essential as sugar, that they should pay it to the government as a tax, than that it should go to swell the profits of the planters.

There are other grounds of the highest importance, showing that the prohibitory duties on foreign sugars should be diminished. It appears, from a petition of certain merchants of Liverpool, presented to the House of Commons last session, that from 1822

to 1827 inclusive, we had exported produce to Brazil of the value of L.19,000,000; and that our imports from that country during the same period had only amounted to L.7,000,000. Last year our exports to Brazil amounted to L.3,820,000, and our imports to L.1,380,000; leaving a balance of L.2,440,000. This singular result is wholly owing to the prohibitory duties on foreign sugar; for of 70,000 tons of sugar that were last year exported from Brazil, more than 65,000 tons were sent *directly* to the Continent; the balance of debt due by the Brazilians to this country being paid by drafts on the continental merchants to whom the sugar was consigned. But had it not been for the prohibition, all this sugar, or by far the largest portion of it, would have been sent to England as an *entrepôt*, and would thus have afforded that employment to the British refiners, and various other classes of persons, that it has afforded to those of Hamburgh and Amsterdam. In fact, nothing but a reduction of the duties on foreign sugars is required to make Great Britain the sole manufactory for the refined sugar of almost all Europe. The business of refining is best understood here; and the cheapness of our fuel, the magnitude of our capital, and our other facilities, give us advantages in it that cannot be rivalled anywhere else. In consequence, however, of our present system, the business is carried on by British capital in the continental ports; and we are thus absurdly doing all we can to deprive ourselves of a branch of industry of which we might otherwise have a monopoly.

The duty on East India sugar ought certainly to be reduced to the same level as that on West India sugar. There neither is, nor can be, any reason why all the productions of the different dependencies of the empire should not be allowed to come into the home market on paying the same duty. The admission of Mauritius sugar at a duty of 27s. is a full concession of the principle; for there is not a single argument that could be alleged in favour of admitting Mauritius sugar at the same duty as West India sugar, that will not equally apply to Bengal sugar. However, we should be satisfied for the present were the discriminating duty on East India sugar reduced to 5s. We believe, indeed, that the West Indians have not so much to fear from the competition of the sugar-growers of Hindostan as was at one time supposed. East India sugar has not, as yet, made any way in the continental markets; and unless its quality be materially improved, or its price considerably reduced, there is but little prospect of its being able to compete with the sugars of Brazil and Cuba.

In proposing that when the duty on British plantation sugar is 18s. or 20s. the duty on foreign sugar should be 26s. or 28s.

it may be said, perhaps, that we are making a sacrifice of principle, and that the public interests require that the duties should all be reduced to the same level. But though it is indispensable that the monopoly of the West Indians should be so reduced as to prevent the intention of the legislature in reducing the duties on sugar from being defeated, we do not think it would be expedient at once to deprive them of all preference. Undoubtedly, however, the duties ought to be gradually equalized. And individuals should be allowed to supply themselves with sugar as with everything else, wherever it can be obtained at the lowest price.

Besides the changes already alluded to, it would be necessary, in order to place the sugar trade on a proper footing, that an alteration should be made in the present plan of granting a drawback on refined sugar. Previously to 1826, the drawback allowed was 46s. a cwt. on single refined sugar, and since then is has been 41s. 6d.; but even at its present reduced rate, it is considerably more than the fair equivalent of the duty paid on the raw. It is the practice in making up returns to Parliament, to reduce the refined sugar exported into raw sugar, by allowing 34 cwt. of the latter to 20 of the former. But the export of sugar is thus made to appear greater than it really is; for, though 34 cwt. of raw may be required to produce 20 cwt. of refined sugar, the whole of the melasses and bastards that remain (about 13 cwt.), are consumed at home. It is therefore highly necessary that the drawback on exportation should be calculated on more accurate principles, and that it should be made to correspond exactly with the duty paid.

As the existing sugar duties expire in the course of this year (1830), we trust that the opportunity will not be neglected of making those alterations in regard to them, and the system on which the trade is conducted, that are so obviously necessary. It is fully in our power to *double* the consumption of sugar in Great Britain, and to *quintuple* it in Ireland, not only without any sacrifice, but with a very great augmentation of revenue, and with many highly important collateral advantages to the trade and navigation of the empire. We are glad that Mr Grant has taken up this question; for it could not be in hands better able to do it justice. And we should hope, that when the Chancellor of the Exchequer comes to consider the subject a little more maturely, he will see that his fears of a loss of revenue are altogether imaginary; and that he will cease to offer, what cannot be other than a reluctant and painful, opposition to alterations which he has himself admitted to be, on many accounts, desirable.

**ART. VII.—1.** *Travels to and from Constantinople, in the years 1827 and 1828; or Personal Narrative of a Journey from Vienna, through Hungary, Transylvania, Wallachia, Bulgaria, and Romelia, to Constantinople; and from that City to the Capital of Austria, by the Dardanelles, Tenedos, the Plains of Troy, Smyrna, Athens, Cyprus, Syria, Alexandria, Malta, Sicily, Italy, Istria, Carniola, and Styria.* By Captain Charles Colville Frankland, R.N. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1829.

**2.** *Travels in Turkey, Egypt, Nubia, and Palestine, in 1824, 1825, 1826, and 1827.* By R. R. Madden, Esq. M.R.C.S. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1829.

**3.** *Narrative of a Journey from Constantinople to England.* By the Rev. R. Walsh, LL.D. 12mo. Third Edition. London, 1829.

**4.** *Constantinople in 1828. A Residence of Sixteen Months in the Turkish Capital and Provinces; with an Account of the present state of the Naval and Military power, and of the Resources of the Ottoman Empire.* By Charles Macfarlane, Esq. 4to. London, 1829.

**A**CCURACY is desirable, even in trifles—if for nothing else, in order to form a habit which may be in readiness for occasions that demand it. Accordingly we comprehend the moral, although not ourselves sufficiently oriental perfectly to sympathise with the earnestness, of Lord Byron's protestation against Lady Morgan's marriage of her *Ida of Athens* to a Disdar Aga. Under the same impression, we are thankful to Mr Macfarlane for removing from the seraglio walls 'the six thousand heads,' and 'the range of immense bones,' with which the romantic schools of French and English imagination had coalesced to decorate the spikes and niches of this despotic palace. But the importance of correctness and of consistency necessarily increases with the subject. The traveller, whom the fame of Miss Kemble's Juliet tempts into the pit of Covent-Garden, may be allowed a smile, (especially if he has ever owed a night's lodging to the hospitality of a Franciscan convent,) at the strange costume in which Protestant carelessness muffles up the accommodating friar. An equal degree of negligence respecting weightier matters in a treatise upon the Monastic Orders, would justify a different feeling. Now, if the prospects of the Ottoman empire are thought worth the pains of grave political deliberation, it is not too exacting to require that the facts, on which its fortune must in the main depend, should be carefully collected; the com-

parison between conflicting statements honestly adjusted; and the ultimate inferences comprehensively and dispassionately drawn.

Little progress can be made towards a rational estimate of the Turkish character, when, without an attempt at reconciling the variance, one page declares, that every British officer (Sir Edward Codrington, we presume, included,) will testify the word of a Turk to be inviolable; and another tells us, that there is no nation in the world where life is so frequently taken away by treachery under the mask of friendship. The Ottoman empire is said to have been for some time past in a state of tottering decay, and to be now apparently on the eve of total dissolution. It is said, also, and truly, that there can be no comparison between the old Spahi forces and the movements of a regular army. The Emperor Nicholas, moreover, is reproached with having failed to exercise the virtue of moderation in breach even of a solemn declaration. Yet the train of these admissions, so fatally conclusive of the weakness of the Turks—of the power, ambition, and treachery of their invaders—is magnificently supported by a singular and somewhat contradictory assertion. It is pronounced clear almost to demonstration, that were it not for ‘the impolitic attack on Navarin,’ and the substitution of a French force for that of Ibrahim Pacha in the Morea, ‘the Russian army would never have crossed the Balkan.’ Our embarrassment in prognosticating what future means may exist in the internal resources of Turkish character and institution for the accomplishment of that most improbable event—a national resuscitation—would be considerably relieved, were only a single syllable of information vouchsafed in aid of the bold notification, that in case Mahmood and the Ulemas could by any possibility have agreed cordially to unite their efforts, it was *at one time* fully in their power to make the Turks both good citizens and good soldiers. Were it shown how this result might *once* have been accomplished, a reader could judge upon the probability whether sufficient capabilities may not still be possibly in reserve. According to this statement, it is most important to learn something concerning these Ulemas and their position. The treaty of Adrianople will not have placed the keys of Constantinople in the hands of Russian generals, if the causes, which made that treaty possible, are once removed. Mere statistical proportions are not fatally overthrown by it. It is the apparent moral and intellectual inferiority which sicklies o’er the Crescent with a pale cast of fear. It is from an apprehension of the materials for good citizenship being at present thoroughly and nationally wanting, that the interests of diplomacy and of humanity are

conceived to be at such painful odds. So cursory a view, and yet so summary an opinion, promise little for the sound practice of our European doctors, now consulting on the case of the Ottoman empire. It is akin to the quackery which prescribes for the ladies of the harem, whilst excluded from their presence, and scarce permitted to feel their pulse.

Total ignorance of the difficulties that complicate this subject, is the only, yet not quite reasonable, excuse for a temerity which thus jumps to its conclusions. No prudent traveller has pretended to put into our hands the warrant for any such peremptory decision. Each describes for himself just what fell under his observation, along the narrow thread of road he chanced to traverse; and retails the information which he managed to pick up in the contracted circle with which he was brought in contact. In the course of a twelvemonth's perambulation over the south of Europe, every rational Englishman, however well introduced, and well acquainted with its languages, must nevertheless have felt that it was little more than the outline and the grouping of a panorama which he was qualified to sketch. Yet every obstacle is multiplied a hundredfold in the East. Intercourse is impeded at each step by modes of life and thought, behind whose curtain we cannot look. The inquisitive Frank is as completely at the mercy of his interpreter for the course and meaning of the commonest conversation, as an unlucky English litigant is dependent on his attorney for an explanation of the pleadings in a lawsuit. Ordinary visitors, under these circumstances, can bring home little more from the East, than the pilgrim and crusader brought some centuries ago—the rough sketch of a Saracen's head to make a sign-post of; and such words of picturesque effect and lyrical cadence, as have succeeded to the *Paynim* and the *Soldan* of the Troubadour. It is only after considerable residence in a country where every habit is so unaccountably opposite to our own, and where no single channel of direct communication can be said to exist, that a knowledge of any thing beyond the surface can, except by singular accident, be procured.

A column may be measured, or an inscription copied—a plant gathered from a mountain's side, a mineral from its bosom, or a triangle be taken on its top—by an observing stranger. But it is far otherwise with the effect of public institutions on national strength and character, and with the still abstruser mysteries of private life. Very able foreigners have made strange work with criticisms on the comparative power of different parts of the English constitution, and with calculations concerning their respective influences on society. English speculations upon the experimental modification even of our own system, as constructed for the use of the United States, have



not been eminently successful. In regard to domestic manners, and the hundred circumstances out of which the individuality of national thought and feeling is insensibly formed within the privacy of a home, the rulers of Hindostan (who, at the end of sixty years, know, in this respect, about as much of their subjects as they did at the beginning) must be aware, that lucky guesses are the most that a government, even, often can arrive at, where an estrangement of language and of religion intervenes. It may be objected, that a domesticated foreigner usually loses his impartiality, either by adopting the prejudices of his adopted land, or by running after the *mirage* of some delusive system. Due allowances must be made for the possibility of thus becoming as it were unconscious renegades. It will not be the less a fact, that residence is the only chance of obtaining the requisite experience. It is not till the Envoy and Physician, the Consul and the Engineer, are half naturalized, that we can have such books as that of D'Ohsson,\* (the slighting notice of which is one of the few unjust references in Gibbon's all-comprehensive notes); of the two Russels,† (so justly praised by De Sacy); of Thornton,‡ —our best general authority, notwithstanding his wrongheadedness and indistinctness; and of Juchereau de St Denys.||

The Levant Company, born under Elizabeth, died, quietly, about four years ago. It long supplied us with our principal information concerning the history of this part of the world, as well as with its productions—with travels and adventures, not less than with figs and turkey carpets. But companies and corporations are not more to be trusted as the most appropriate instruments for the improvement of knowledge than of trade; except during their tender infancy. Notwithstanding some favourable exceptions, the neglect, to which the literary portion of their office was from the first abandoned, had not, since the time of Rycaut, been redeemed by such extraordinary activity, that the surrender of their charter ought to alarm the reading, more than it has alarmed the commercial, world. Rycaut prefaced his supplement to Knolles, by declaring, that ‘he undertook his work from a certain emulation of the French and Italian writers; of whose Ministers few but brought away Memoirs of their times; in which our nation hath been so defective, that besides some scattered and abrupt papers at the end

\* *Tableau Général de l'Empire Othoman.* 3 tom. Fol. Paris 1790—1821.

† *The Natural History of Aleppo, &c.* 2 vols. 4to. London, 1794.

‡ *The Present State of Turkey.* 4to. London. 1807.

|| *Révolutions de Constantinople en 1807 et 1808, précédées d'Observations générale sur l'Empire Othoman.* Paris. 1819.

‘of Knolles’s *History of the Turks* (which is an excellent collection from divers authors), one shall scarce find five sheets of ‘paper wrote by our countrymen in the way of history.’ The supposed immoveableness of Oriental despotism is since pushed somewhat from its base. ‘The present state of Turkey,’ as described by Rycant towards the end of the seventeenth century, and even by Thornton in 1807, is materially different from ‘the ‘present state’ of 1830. The style of author and of book that the greedy impatience of the English public calls for, appears, from the slight materials which booksellers find it worth their while to crowd into the market, to have undergone at least an equal change. Lack of news, however, it is very evident, is the last inconvenience we need fear. An able Pen from Paternoster Row will soon be expected to accompany every army. Already do our Booksellers, as well as Newspapers, seem to establish a connexion in every country, as it happens to become the theatre of war, or of any other equally exciting exhibition. In the rapid manufacture, communication, and consumption of literary novelties, Turkey is certain of not being passed over. Independent Greece will be an excellent half-way-house of observation. The *Courrier de Smyrne*, which apparently outlanders the ordinary slander against England, that certain French Periodicals cultivate as a profession, is not destined to monopolize the gossip of the Levant.

The volumes which head this article are an earnest of what the future has in store for us. Their merit is as various as the professions of their authors, with which, however, it has no connexion. Not one of them makes pretension to research in a single branch of science; to any kind of classical illustration; or to the slightest innovation upon the state of geographical ignorance, which leaves five-sixths of a map of Asia Minor still a blank. Their object is confined to a description of the country, and of manners; heightened occasionally by such historical and political observation as is particularly in request at the present moment.

Captain Frankland’s route and narrative are creditable applications of the activity so natural to an officer not on service. His personal friends ought to be much obliged to him for a journal, which, in a pleasant and unaffected tone, makes them the companions of his tour. But it is rather reckoning too much on the recent appetite for every thing regarding Turkey, to conclude, that it has sufficient substance to authorise its solemn serving up at that great literary ordinary, the public press. Whilst reading it, we thought of Johnson’s brutal speech about a dinner. A dinner may be very well, yet not good enough to ask a stranger to; still less to make him pay for.

Mr Madden's Letters sparkle with an air of adventure which gets at last quite startling. They look like the materials that Ariosto might have collected for a rambling extravaganza, the rhymes of which, his booksellers' golden wand had converted into authentic prose. He has, unfortunately, not the art of gaining the confidence of his reader. Personal incidents rise up with the smartness of a Spanish comedy; and are often so well described, that, according to the ungrateful return which professed story-tellers meet with, the credit of the fact occasionally is endangered by the cleverness of the narration. The Faculty must settle what new light he has thrown upon the Plague and the Mummy. In the meanwhile, we hope that his medical instructions to travellers in these critical countries are more consistent than his advice to them upon their behaviour. 'The haughty carriage and uncompromising manners' of our countrymen, are, in the preface, made responsible for the 'notorious fact' of their being particularly unfortunate; whilst his own good humour softened to mercy the Syrian banditti into whose hands he so often fell; and placed him 'on terms of familiarity, if not of friendship, with Turks and Arabs, whose violence kept other Franks in awe.' A guide is rather mystifying who teaches at the beginning, that it is inconceivable how far ferocity and fanaticism may be subdued by good temper; and yet afterwards follows up the warning by a precisely opposite prescription: 'I had often to observe in my intercourse with this people, that gentleness and civility were either received as the homage of an inferior, or the simplicity of a fool; to be respected, I often found it necessary to be haughty even with the highest, and to be arrogant to avoid getting affronted.' This, too, in a country where a Doctor is almost a sacred person, as having the issues of life and death, of fertility and barrenness, in his hands.

It would be curious to know the qualifications on which are founded a claim to dispose, in half a dozen words, of the comparative reputation of Arabian poets. 'The great merit of Mahomet consisted, not in writing the Koran (for I have far better poetry of his time in my possession), but in making so trifling a production the instrument of reclaiming his idolatrous countrymen.' Oriental and European tastes are confessedly dissimilar. But no quarter of the globe can differ concerning the presumption which thus saucily overrules native judgment, learned and unlearned, within a province so peculiarly removed from foreign jurisdiction. The English abstain from attempting to reverse the Gallican verdict in favour of Racine: the French no longer put Shakspeare below Pope. The Persians, as well as Arabs, are passionately fond of poetry. If their fancy is too partial to conceits, they know the merit of those

higher strains, which, coming from the heart, mount into the head like wine. Distinguished writers among them have dedicated their lives to criticism; and they have voluminous annotations, as long even as our western commentators could desire, on one short Arab poem. The seven golden ones hung up in the Caaba were the most celebrated productions of contemporary Bards. The Mahomedan world has a singular test upon this particular subject. Admirers of Homer will think poetical excellence in a barbarous age no decisive proof of miraculous interposition. But no objection can be taken to the test as a question of degree between rival poems. The inspiration of the Koran is universally put on this single issue of internal evidence—that unassisted human genius could never attain to any thing as a composition so inimitably perfect.

Mr Madden's general view of polygamy and harems would require a greater disproportion of the sexes than what Bruce once imagined he had discovered in the East: 'It has been my fortune,' says he, 'to have attended, for many months past, in the harems both of the upper and lower classes; and amongst the latter I was surprised to find no dearth either of luxury or loveliness. In the harem of a pipe-manufacturer, who keeps a stall in the bazaar, I was ushered into an apartment furnished with costly carpets and richly covered divans. I expected to find nothing but misery, and every thing was splendid. Amongst the fair inmates of the harem I could distinguish the pale Circassian from the languid Georgian, and the slender Greek from the voluptuous Ottoman. All the pipes in the man's stall appeared not to be worth fifty dollars: but how the Turks manage to maintain their harems I never could learn. When you ask a Moslem, he says, "God is great;" and great, indeed, must be the bounty which enables a pipe-maker to feed and clothe six times as many women as would be sufficient, in England, to send a mechanic to the work-house.' Afterwards, in Nubia, the fact that polygamy is not very common there, is contrasted with our author's experience among the Arabs. According to the impression conveyed by these remarks, almost every Mussulman draws on the Prophet for his full allowance of four wives,—without reckoning slaves at discretion; besides the supernumeraries required for such occasional recreations as that (p. 197.) of a Pasha throwing every Greek woman in his harem into the sea for the infidelity of one of their companions. Mr Walpole speaks much more sparingly, when he says, 'the practice of polygamy, so prevalent among the higher orders in this country, so contrary to the strict injunction of their law, has contributed to diminish the population of it.' Yet this paragraph, moderate as it is, is

perhaps more open to criticism than any other in his excellent discourse prefixed to the *Memoirs relating to Turkey*. We have been assured by a Persian gentleman, that, out of an extensive acquaintance, consisting of several hundred persons, he did not know in Persia ten who availed themselves of this corrupting and disastrous privilege. The conclusive objections derived from the expense, and the unhappiness attending the experiment, must be just as powerful in Turkey. Pallas's evidence is to the same effect, in his description of the Crimea. 'Polygamy rarely occurs, even among the nobles and more wealthy inhabitants of towns; yet there are some persons in the villages who incumber themselves with two wives.' D'Ohsson, speaking expressly of the Turks, states, 'Il est peu d'exemples que deux femmes vivent ensemble.' It is clear, that the rival jealousies, which thus make separate establishments a matter of indispensable necessity, must limit so costly a luxury within very narrow bounds. According to Thornton, in the case of marriage with a woman of equal rank, a duplicate is frequently guarded against in the marriage-contract. Even where a first wife is of inferior condition, or a purchased slave, 'the Turks, without much speculative reasoning on the subject, seldom resort, in practice, to institutions so injurious to the interests of society.' Juchereau says, to the same effect, 'Il paroît qu'ils trouvent si peu d'agrémens dans ces nœuds où leurs droits et devoirs matrimoniaux sont fixés par les lois, qu'il n'arrive presque jamais qu'ils en prennent plus d'une.' (tom. ii. p. 278.) The numerical equality of the sexes has been supposed to intimate something like a secret marriage-act on the part of nature. Has any one enquired, whether any difference in the proportion obtains among animals that herd promiscuously, and those that consort in pairs?

A writer, who has not yet won his first spurs, appears to disadvantage when he is seen sneering at names hitherto considered entitled to some respect. Dr Clarke is represented as a bad observer. There are seven errors in two pages on the Dead Sea. Poor Herodotus fares as ill. The father of history, it might be submitted in extenuation, did the best for us he could. For many of his facts, his only accessible authorities were the Egyptian priesthood. In the absence of our enlightening and superintending press, we doubt whether an Egyptian would obtain, even now, and from among ourselves, materials for a faultless History of England, were he exclusively reduced to the Bench of Bishops and the Chapter of Cathedral Towns for historical information. We of the present day are by no means disposed to take Mr Madden's word against Herodotus, in matters of olden time. In mo-

dern investigations, he has raised no great presumption in his favour, even on points more nearly appertaining to his profession, when he is found differing from other writers. Pritchard treats the common opinion, by which the Copts have been admitted to represent the ancient Egyptians, as a settled fact in the history of our species. Some clever Frenchmen having failed in making out Sesostris to have been a negro, Mr Madden comes in with a Nubian hypothesis. He boldly supports it by a reference to the corporal evidence contained in a case of mummies. (Vol. ii. p. 89.) The measurements of the heads of twelve mummies, twelve Copts, and twelve Nubians, are given in a table. Of several thousands of mummy heads, which he supposes he must have seen, he never found one with a broad expanded forehead, by which the Copt is principally distinguished; whilst the black skin and short woolly hair of the former Egyptians belong to the Nubians at present. The *Voice from the Tombs*, it would appear, however, is far from being as decisive as it is positively appealed to. No traveller in Egypt is entitled to greater personal credit than Browne. He anticipated this peculiar mode of proof, and founded on it a directly contrary conclusion. According to him, the genuine descent of the Copts from the Egyptians is a point so clearly established by mummies still entire, that a vanity of national pedigree, and a prescience of the inquisitiveness of posterity, might be supposed to have led to the curious provision by which this ancient people had hoped to guard against our mistakes. As the precaution has not answered, perhaps the head ascribed to the younger Memnon may be used as an additional witness in this dilemma. Our author is equally adventurous in another theory, which, however, he is satisfied with asserting, rather than investigating. There could be no difficulty in verifying a fact of so popular a nature, as any physical question connected with the history of the Mamelukes. This singular race of *Esclaves-Rois*, after having governed Egypt for 300 years, has been, to the injury and reproach of England, treacherously extinguished in our days. According to *Anastasius* (vol. i. p. 332), the custom by which these military republicans perpetuated their corporation, originated, for the most part, in the forced and corrupting celibacy which wasted the prolific period of youth among fellow-soldiers under a patron's roof. Their prejudices led them, when emancipated in after years, to turn from the women of the country with debilitated systems and perverted imaginations. The result, however, probably, would not have been very different, had they married the grand-daughters of the Ptolemies. The fact which is thus related as a specialty, and depending on peculiar circumstances, had been previously generalised by Volney (vol. i. p. 99) into a

law of nature; in analogy to some obstinate exotics in the vegetable world. The Mamelukes, European slaves themselves, considered their countrywomen alone worthy the honour of their bed. The attempt to plant a purely foreign race in the soil of Egypt ended in a complete failure. The European constitution would not acclimate itself so suddenly to its new position; and the families died off in the next generation. This story is strange enough, one would have thought. Mr Madden's version is still stranger. He conceives that the obligation of fresh supplies of Circassian beauty for Mameluke lovers did not depend on the vicious habits of these upstart tyrants, nor on any disdain for the charms of the Cleopatras of the Nile. The marriage between a Circassian and an Egyptian is represented as altogether barren (vol. ii. p. 229.) 'As they found that marriage with Egyptian women was attended with no increase, they kept up their numbers by the constant purchase of slaves in their own countries.' In the first place, the supposed result is contrary to positive experiment; in the next, it would be so anomalous a phenomenon in the history of man, that it is not uncharitable to set it down as being only a slovenly variety of Volney's philosophical suggestion. As an explanation, it has a farther disadvantage. It gives us this curious solution in pure gratuity; since, unlike Volney's, it leaves the original difficulty unexplained. Its inventor must engraft that system upon his own, or we shall still have to enquire why the Mamelukes could not keep up their race from among their children, (the produce of these supposed marriages with their countrywomen,) without being compelled to recruit, for so many successive generations, from abroad. We will give only another instance, trifling enough in itself, of the little trouble apparently taken to obtain any approach to precision, where, nevertheless, the language has all the confidence of perfect knowledge. The Gypsies are described as being Egyptians driven out under Zinganeus, 'about 1512,' when Selim I. conquered Egypt; to whose possession they talk of being restored, as the Jews to Jerusalem. If Mr Madden will compare notes with Dr Walsh (p. 323), he will find that they first appeared in Bohemia 'about 1408.' Dr Bright's *Travels in Hungary* contain ample references in regard to their first appearance, and present condition, in Europe. We have elsewhere heard striking confirmations of the fidelity of the glossary of 400 words, by Grellman, as well as the derivations of several others, which Dr Bright has printed in his Appendix; wherein an undeniable connexion is established between the Gypsy vocabulary and the Hindostanee. There seems no ~~relating~~ <sup>relating</sup> the conclusion that the Gypsies are either Hindoo fugitives driven originally to emigration, or the remnants of native ~~people~~ <sup>people</sup> which were brought

(probably by Tamerlane) from India, and left behind on his return. These observations may justify our scepticism in Mr Madden; especially when we see him hurrying on in apparent ignorance or contempt of abler predecessors.

The mob of readers in all countries likes to be astonished; and writers, accordingly, are forthcoming to gratify this taste. The English have another passion, in itself much less excusable, and, unfortunately, so general, as to have become almost a national reproach. There is grown up a low propensity to minute and gossiping anecdotes about everything respecting Lords and Ladies, which pervades every county town, and runs through the whole community. It seems made up of prying, vanity, and scandal. There are certain Newspapers and Novels, whose miserable existence for the day is eked out by pandering to it. However far a luckless member of the peerage may fly for an asylum, some tormentor is found to hunt his victim out. One of the concluding chapters of Mr Madden's work is taken up with a relation of a dialogue, supposed to have been held between Lady Hester Stanhope and her visitor, in her sort of feudal hold near Bairout. An author of so much spirit would not thank us for the stultifying supposition, that he is not aware of the only impression which his description can convey. We hardly know, on the remaining alternative, whether it is most for his interest that the conversation should be considered to be a dramatic scene that he has taken the liberty of imagining, or an unfortunate instance either of confidence or accident which has been abused.

The most interesting and original portion of Dr Walsh's book is that which relates to Constantinople itself, and especially to the Greeks of the Fanal. We fear his sympathy has led him to overrate their merits. His prolonged residence with the embassy must have given him great advantages for observation; the chief fruits of which, we are happy to find, are still to come before the public in another shape. We hope that he will resist the temptation of appearing to refer *en savant* to subjects with which he is imperfectly acquainted. Superficial botany and conjectural antiquarianism only lessen the respect due to his ordinary narrative. It is singular that, in discussing the probable origin of the Saxon colonies in Transylvania, Dr Walsh should think it worth his while to subjoin to more learned varieties of explanation the oral account given him by one of themselves, at Hermanstadt. This statement of their martyr pedigree drives them out of Saxony at as late a period as the beginning of the Reformation. It afterwards fixes them, as an advanced post, at the mouth of the great pass through which the



Turks were wont to issue; thus forming, by their persons, a Protestant barrier for Christendom. It is scarcely necessary to remark upon the absurdity of an hypothesis that is contradicted by the language in which writers, contemporary with the Reformation, speak of the Saxons, as already old inhabitants of this country. Busbequius, for instance, after enumerating some German words repeated to him in 1557 by an envoy from the Tauric Chersonese, simply adds, 'Whether these people be Goths or Saxons, I cannot tell. If Saxons, then, I suppose they were transplanted thither in the time of Charles the Great, who dispersed that nation into many remote countries, as appears by the cities of Transylvania, which to this day are inhabited by Saxons.' The rate at which Dr Walsh travelled homewards, renders it impossible that the description of the wretched provinces through which he galloped should be more than a compilation on the faith of others; or the generalisation of personal remarks, far too few and cursory to derive much authority from the fact that they are his own.

Of all the tourists whom the late demand has tempted to the press, Mr Macfarlane will, beyond comparison, most reward the reader. The main purport of his book is specifically adapted to the very points on which the curiosity of the moment is most alive. It is in vain for any body to think that he can add a touch to the finished sketch of manners which *Anastasius* has given of this part of the Eastern world. But, for the condition of its politics, temper, and prominent interests just at present, an authority so recent and so satisfactory as Mr Macfarlane is a greater piece of good fortune than it would have been reasonable to expect. Like Jucherau, he has had the advantage of witnessing its different elements, not dormant, as in ordinary times, but in activity. The anatomist, to calculate the force of antagonist muscles, must see them at the stretch, and not merely in repose. Some previous knowledge, however, should be booked up, or a state of things so anomalous as the actual condition of the Ottoman Empire, will be imperfectly understood by an European.

The danger lies not in the paucity, but in the multitude, of counsellors. Impetuous enquirers would lose their way among an infinitude of topics;—would embarrass themselves by a vain attempt to embrace all, instead of selecting the most important;—would despair of discriminating betwixt contradictory authorities, which no ingenuity can reconcile; and would only err by rule, under universal propositions, concerning which they had never been informed whether any or what limitations were required. The study of the Koran is of no more use in judg-

ing of a Mussulman, than that of the Bible of a Christian population. D'Ohsson's elaborate work is a faithful representation of the letter of the law. Its value, therefore, as a representation of the actual state of the Ottoman community must depend on the credit due to a venerable Mufti, who assured Dr Russel that the probability was always in favour of the practice being in direct opposition to the law. Such political events as alone find their way into formal Chronicles have little influence on the real spirit of a people. But there is even less encouragement than usual to wade through a history of Turkey, since there are no means of tracing the course of whatever little influence such events may have really exercised. Besides, our only staple history, is the endless one of Knolles. Few modern students will look into folios that frightened Gibbon, and which no one can examine, without admiration of the patience of our ancestors, and wonderment at Johnson's panegyric. Thornton's first and second chapters will, however, answer every immediate purpose. The careful summary of the 'Causes of the Weakness and Decline of the Turkish Monarchy,' leaves a gleaner of additional reasons, and of corroborative facts, connected with later periods, very little to supply. Whoever has found leisure to journey over these most interesting but devoted countries, in company with the intelligent travellers whom Europe, of late years, has sent out to spy the nakedness of the land, will scarcely find a page which does not recall, both the fidelity of the miniature pencil of *Anastasius*, and the good sense of the above-mentioned summary, by Mr Walpole.\*

Until another French Revolution, or Napoleon the Second, shall spring up to 'doff the world aside,' no questions of humanity, or policy, can be more urgent than those relating to Turkey. We need only mention the extent and richness of the countries over which the Crescent floats,—their central position lying across the commercial thoroughfare of half the globe; the condition of so many millions of human beings; and the temptation which an easy prey suggests to long delayed, but deeply-meditated aggrandizements, inconsistent, apparently, with the politics and peace of Europe. Recent events must have convinced even Lord Aberdeen, that an ancient empire, which was once supposed more than a match for the whole of Christendom, is at present unequal to keep the field against a single, and that its most recent power. How has such a change been brought about? Kingdoms, like individuals, neither can be helped, nor deserve to be

---

\* *Memoirs relating to European and Asiatic Turkey*, vol. i.

so, but when they can also help themselves. Before a crusade in behalf of the Turks of the nineteenth century should be allowed to furnish after ages with a theme of speculation only one degree less curious than the opposite crusades of our barbarian forefathers, it will be wise to examine the crisis which this government has reached. The change we believe to be greater, as compared with the advance of all Europe, than absolutely in itself. It has been also on both sides gradual;—gradual improvement, and gradual decay. It is not, however, the less true, that a reform from top to bottom can alone make Turkey a really independent kingdom, in its relations with foreign states; as well as can alone enable it to claim the title, or answer any one of the ends of a government, as far as it regards the people, whose obedience it nevertheless demands. Will, and can, the government reform itself? In case internal reformatations are delayed, not a year can pass but some circumstance or other may arrive, under which a neighbour, whose border interests are so much intermingled, may choose to step forward, and hew to pieces with his sword a system where the corruptions of society threaten to bring back a state of nature in its most disheartening form. If the Turk will not take the first half of the alternative, is Christendom prepared to prevent the other? and, by interposing a cordon of ambassadors between the advanced posts of an invading army and the capital, perpetuate a daily accumulating mass of internal misery, merely lest the diplomatic balance should risk being disarranged? The present generation is not likely to be called upon to go to war for an Ockzakow, any more than for the recovery of the Holy Land, or the conversion of the Turks. However, the peace of Adrianople can be nothing but a truce, whether of months or years. Mankind, meanwhile, is every way interested that the ‘ancient allies’ of the Porte should solemnly press upon its now trembling divan the imperious necessity of improvement, thorough and immediate, as the price of any possible sympathy and aid. Such improvements can alone save them, upon the next hostilities, from the contemptible attitude of poor protesting bystanders; or humane and civilized governments, from the odious one of arming in the cause of a despotism irreclaimably sanguinary and imbecile. We shall be in a better way towards just notions of the present capabilities of Turkey, if we do not over-rate the past. But it is difficult to speak positively concerning former ages, in a case where accurate knowledge on the ordinary materials which form the most efficient items of national power, (such as population, wealth, and character,) is, up to the present hour, out of the question.

If the population of Constantinople is a mystery, that of the

provinces must be still more so. Dallaway reckons that of Constantinople at 400,000. Olivier, in 1793, calculating according to the quantity of corn distributed, and at the rate of a pound and a half a person, states the amount at 500,000. Jucherau, in 1807, after mentioning that some raise it to 1,100,000, adopts the same test as Olivier : he only allows a pound a-head, and arrives at 900,000. Mr Madden specifies the several proportions of its present population, and sums up the total at 800,000. It should be remembered, that between the period of these estimates, (indeed within the last twenty years,) Dr Walsh conjectures that 400,000 lives were lost by civil commotion, by fire, and by the plague. In 1812, 300,000 died of the plague. During Dr Walsh's residence, about 20,000 were burnt in conflagrations, raised by discontented Janissaries, &c. The insurrections by the Janissaries in 1806 and 1807 cost the lives of two sultans and 30,000 subjects. Thirty thousand of the Janissaries themselves are supposed to have fallen, when the long-called for era of retribution came, upon their suppression in 1825. Twenty thousand Greeks fell in 1821, in the massacre of the Fanal. The vicissitudes in this enumeration are not so incredible as that an increase should appear to be going on, in a city where the waste of life is evidently greater, and where the supply, from causes more or less disgraceful, is less than in any other city in the world. The decay of population on these accounts was so fully admitted in Rycaut's time, that he supposes it to be made up by an annual importation of about 20,000 slaves into the capital. This mode of supply must have exceedingly decreased. The conjectures as to the whole population of the empire run even wider of each other. Tooke rates it as high as forty-nine; others as low as twenty-eight millions. Jucherau estimates it, after references to the Turkish Chancery, at thirty-three millions and a half. A country, where the capitalist dreads the reputation of being rich, and where a jewel is of some real use, as a sort of property easily secreted, (so that fools have not the monopoly of diamonds, as in Europe,) would puzzle Colquhoun for guesses at its wealth.

Respecting the character of the people, Dr Russel has collected, in a note, two or three pages of diametrically opposite opinions. We could add nearly as many more out of later writers, and the contradictory declarations made to us by acquaintances of our own, founded upon what they believed to be their own personal experience. Browne and Burckhardt may be supposed to have been equally qualified for an undertaking, to which they felt a call as decided as any missionary. They both travelled through the East as Mussulmans, and

were, therefore, both equally behind the scenes. Burckhardt has left a horrible picture of the infamies practised even within the sacred walls of Mecca. Browne, in a laboured comparison of the wisdom, virtue, and happiness of the nations of the East with those of Europe, concludes by deciding in favour of the former. Mr Madden never passed through the Bazaar without having dogs set on him; they are suffered, he says, to prowl in every corner of the city, for the diversion they afford in worrying Frank passengers. A friend of ours, during a long stay in Constantinople, never experienced nor witnessed the slightest incivility—not even the apparently common courtesy of a lady spitting in his face. According to one letter, Sultan Mahmood is a charlatan, a ruffian, and a drunkard. On the word of another traveller, he is the most finished gentleman of any sovereign in Europe. It is evident, therefore, that the search after accuracy in any earlier record, on points like these, will be as vain a pursuit as Gibbon found it among the Byzantine historians. The very name of the Grand Turk acted formerly almost like an incantation. Without raising up those exaggerated phantoms, once so popular, of a mysterious greatness, whose reality, when enquired into, eludes the grasp, the original success of the Osmanlis (the name they love), and their scrambling retention of what had once fallen into their clutches, were at no time phenomena that bespoke them the predestinated masters of the world. They were headed, in succession, by ten warrior sultans, cradled in the camp. Such a line of personal supremacy is not only quite unrivalled in the history of their opponents; it is what no other family can boast of. The passion for being always wandering, which belonged to these horsemen-tribes, gave them a great facility in moving their numbers at a moment. A love of arms is too natural to want even the encouragement of conquest, which yet they so enthusiastically enjoyed. Every victory would facilitate the next. Among decaying institutions and fluctuating tribes, their system was just firm and civilized enough to form a nucleus, around which an empire, partly real and partly nominal, could cohere. Carpini, who was sent on a Tartar embassy when Europe was alarmed by the invasion of Muscovy, saw, even so early, that an army which was not to be cashiered when such an enemy retired, was the only permanent security against the military system that necessarily grew out of a life of war. However, from the moment that they came in collision with any thing that deserves the name of a government or a people, they are indebted to our own long incorrigible folly for whatever appearance of superiority they have frequently assumed, and may have occasionally possessed.

The conquest of Constantinople in the middle of the fifteenth century may be easily understood. Supernatural assistance could alone have saved a city which was betrayed by its Genoese guests to a besieging army of 200,000 soldiers; and where a Palæologus could find only 8000 fighting men. The barbarian strength of the assailant, and the corrupted weakness of the assailed, make the entry of Mahomet II. into Constantinople little else in the history of general causes than a repetition of Attila's entry into Rome. The rest of Europe, indeed, happened to be in a state which enabled it to moralize more philosophically, and record more faithfully the latter transaction than the former. The religious bigotry of the Latin Church, which, on other occasions, has figured as the active partisan of the Janissary's sabre, was restrained, on the present startling event, to an acquiescent acknowledgment that nothing better could be hoped of a people whose heart was hardened against the spiritual supremacy of Rome. Fortunately, a new crusade was only preached and sworn to, but never actually undertaken, in order to prevent this torrent from deluging the rest of Christendom. The form of society, however imperfectly compacted, was sufficiently settled to turn it back. Mahomet II. failed against Scanderberg, Hunniades, and Rhodes. The impediments, apparently so feeble, by which this mighty conqueror was thus arrested in his triumph, are perpetual reproaches to the cowardice which despairs of nations. There can be no monuments more religiously dear to freedom than names which prove what a few brave men, when not wanting to themselves, may gloriously perform. The intent to 'subdue proud Italy,' left by him as a motto for his tomb, is a legacy which his successors have been so far from making good, that they have never seriously even attempted to enforce it. The Sultan-threat to feed his horse with a bushel of oats on the high altar at St Peter's, and to shovel Malta into the sea with pick-axe and mattock, were swelling words, breathing more of the harem than of the throne—the flattered idol than the king. The Turkish navy found as much employment as it desired, often more than it could manage, in extending its power over the Grecian Archipelago. At a later period, if the Venetian government had not been so deservedly detested, that the natives regarded that of the Mussulman as the lesser evil, the mouth of the Dardanelles might probably have become the western limit, and the Crescent never have superseded the Lion of St Mark. There is positive evidence of this unfavourable comparison after the peace of Carlovitz had ceded the Morea to Venice. Motraye heard the Greeks there verifying the prediction of Sandys, and regretting their

former masters. ‘When we obeyed the Turks, we enjoyed all possible liberty, on paying the moderate contribution of three or four crowns, which, to the most opulent among us, was never increased above ten. No greater burdens were imposed upon us either in peace or war; and on these terms we were indulged in the free exercise of our religion and the practice of our several professions.’ As the Greeks of Constantinople chose that St Sophia should be converted into a mosque, rather than they would unite in prayer with the Western Church; so the Greeks of the Morea chose to replace themselves under the yoke of Achmet, rather than remain subjects of a Romish power. If sufferings redeem a nation, we trust they now will have no regrets for some centuries to come.

To the north, the Turkish force has wasted itself on the Danube; beyond which, although its banner has been always floating,—fortresses garrisoned, and tribute paying, yet its recognised and independent empire can be scarcely said to have been at any time thoroughly established. The greater part of its possessions in Europe date among its earliest conquests, under circumstances that affirm only the feebleness which was so soon and so effectually checked in this direction. The intermediate story is one long recital of misery and crime. The successive revolts, submissions, and intrigues of the Princes of Transylvania, into which Wallachia and Moldavia were often drawn,—see-sawing between the Emperor and the Sultan, as the passion or ambition of the instantswayed their rulers,—were long marked with all the perfidy of our middle ages. The countries enclosed within the Danube, as a base, and the arc of the Carpathian mountains, were turned, during two centuries of convulsive rebellion, into one vast battle-plain. The condition of society may be imagined from Rycaut’s statement, that, as late as the latter part of the seventeenth century, 5000 men on a side, without cannon, was not considered war in Hungary, but only martial exercise. An eye-witness bears testimony on which side, whether of Germany or Turkey, the balance towards a tolerable government inclined. ‘I have seen multitudes of Hungarian rustics set fire to their cottages, and fly with their wives and children, their cattle, and instruments of labour, to the Turkish territories; where they knew that, besides the payments of the tenths, they would be subject to no imposts or vexations.’ (Leunclavius.) Insurrection followed on insurrection in Hungary, from no other cause than religious persecution. The Mufti found an active recruiting serjeant in the Bishop of Vienna, who held out (as in 1606) for the ruin of the kingdom, by war and by the Turks, rather than consent to freedom of religion in Bohemia. Pink-

erton, in his History of the Greek Church, alludes to a sect which was more persecuted by the Germans than by the Mahomedans, from its aversion to pictures. Dr Walsh admits, (and it is irreconcilable with the legend of a barrier of Saxons Protestants,) that ‘the Protestants of Transylvania were frequently supported by the Turks in the divisions which agitated the country under Ragotzki; and they are represented by their adversaries with having made this unnatural alliance against their Christian brethren.’ The reproach belongs, in truth, not to the oppressed, but to the oppressor, by whose tyranny they were maddened to this terrible alternative.

Austria has to thank only her own obstinate appetite for misgovernment, that a Vizier has twice encamped around Vienna, and that also in 1603, the Turkish foragers carried off their prisoners from under its walls. Nothing but the breach by Leopold of their national privileges, (privileges which, on his accession, he had solemnly sworn he would maintain,) called, in 1678, the Hungarians to arms—put the crown on Tekeli's head at Buda, and brought 200,000 Turks for the last time into the heart of Europe. It was well enough for Filicaja in his glorious *canzone*, to represent it as a contest for the deliverance of Christendom from Idolatry. An historian has another and a separate account to settle; and will not forget the party who sought refuge in the arms of a ferocious ally from a more intolerable yoke. Rycaut, describing the events which precipitated that crisis, expressly states, ‘that the Hungarians had greater liberty of conscience from the Turks than from the Germans. John Sobieski, whilst glorying in the expulsion of the Mahomedans from Hungary, after its partial occupation for near two centuries, admits the antipathy with which the people whom he had rescued regarded the alternative that was before them.’ ‘If,’ they said, ‘it is desired that we should renounce the protection of the Sultan, nothing remains for us, but to demand that of the king of Poland.’ On one side, the horrible ravages committed in this campaign by Turk and Tartar—on the other, the massacre of the peasants by his Lithuanian army, and the pillage of churches by the Polish troops under his own immediate command, may give some idea of that Austrian government, from the thought of which the natives shrunk even in the very presence of these terrors. There are occasions when misers even can part with money; and when the family of Hapsburg might have been expected to remember, that it belonged to the human, as well as to the imperial race. The frigid ceremony with which the King of Poland was received—the utter neglect to which the common



wants of his army, even of his sick and wounded, were abandoned by a sovereign, whose capital the day before he had saved from conflagration,—merely disgusted a noble spirit that was not to be provoked. But the ill treatment was the same, and the dissatisfaction louder throughout the other classes, of whom the confederation was composed. ‘All the world is discouraged and ill-disposed. It is martyrdom to hear all that the subalterns are saying. They go even so far as to regret that we have succoured the Emperor. They had rather this haughty race had perished never to rise again.’

It was not till the middle of the fifteenth century that Muscovy, which had been Christian ever since the tenth, shook off the Mahomedan conquerors, who had held her in bondage for two hundred years. She had yet to grovel for another as long, and almost equally dismal period, in a rugged unformed half Asiatic state, whilst awaiting the birth of that Franklin among sovereigns, who was to lick her bulk into a living shape. It is only some one hundred and fifty years since she resumed the name of Russia. The vices of a most imperfect constitution, to which the Empress Catherine afterwards so infamously pandered for the purposes of national dismemberment, must always have kept the permanent means of Poland far below the rank where her name is placed, by our admiration of her valour, and our sympathy with her wrongs. The predominant party in that divided country committed a further act of political suicide, by arming against it all members of the Greek and Protestant communions, whom it excluded from office and from the diet. George III. directed his minister at Warsaw, to deliver in 1767, a declaration on the part of his majesty in favour of that ‘oppressed part of the Polish nation, known by the name of Dissidents.’ The king of Ireland was well qualified to enforce the ‘injustice and the impolicy of excluding the professors of Christian doctrine from honourable employment, and from the means of serving the state;’ and ‘to call on the wisdom of the nation assembled, by re-establishing them in their rights and privileges, to provide a remedy for the evils by which it was distracted.’ If the Polish nobility had but listened to this, (considering all things, somewhat singular,) remonstrance, they would have saved their country for a time from civil war and foreign subjugation. In the event of the Sultan having succeeded in the war, which the Russian usurpations in Poland, contrary to the treaty of Pruth, provoked on this occasion, the secret of his success must have been looked for in the manifesto placed in his hands by the confederacy of Bar. It declared that the safety of the Republic depended on his efforts in their cause. It is

from its skirmishes of centuries with these three kingdoms, Austria, Muscovy, and Poland, that the notion of an irresistible Ottoman empire was derived. Yet even against kingdoms in this condition,—the one, revolting by its dulness and its bigotry—the other, barbarous in its Tartar ignorance—the last, tortured by institutions made to disorganize rather than unite society, it had never sufficient power to do more than waste and harass them; at no time could it permanently prevail.

But it is now a hundred and thirty years since the eyes of Austria were in some degree (and in this corner of her provinces at least) opened to her folly. Transylvania, the lock and key of Upper Hungary, was confirmed to her by the letter of a treaty, which more moderate counsels on her own part have improved into a treaty of lasting peace. So far from the Hungarians leaning towards the Turks in the recent contest, Dr Walsh was frequently reminded how strongly the popular feeling set the other way. It was only when he had crossed into Austria itself, that he found the tables turned. Prints of Turkish cruelties were not allowed beyond the frontiers; and all signs of public sympathy with the Greeks were officially suppressed. The government of Vienna, still faithful to the principle of despotism, feels that the cause of the Divan in Bucharest is the cause of the Aulic chamber at Milan and at Venice. In the mean time, Christendom is protected in this quarter by a barrier stronger than the Carpathian chain;—by the acknowledgment (so slowly and reluctantly earned) that the rule of Austria has become more favourable to the happiness of its subjects than the sovereignty of the Turks. If a prescription were to be carefully prepared for making the worst imaginable form of government, it would probably be that which has been established in Wallachia and Moldavia, whereby three different sources of dissension are secured. These provinces (much worse off than Bulgaria, a strictly Turkish territory) have been kept under a triple harrow. They are tributary to the Porte—have had Greek Hospodars from the Faual for their governors—and are cursed with the right of interference on the part of Russia for their nominal protection. These Wallachians are the very people on whom the Transylvanians look down over their mountain wall; whom, according to Mr Waddington, they will see unlike any thing Christian, but resembling the most degraded of all Mahomedans, the Fellahs of Egypt. (*Greek Church*, p. 14.) The Wallachians also, fortunately enough, happen to be the only people whom we ever heard of that are described as having a positive predilection for the Austrian sceptre. They have indulged this singular passion ever since 1688. Refugees from

Wallachia pass over into Lower Hungary, and the Bannat of Temeswar; where a crafty policy assures these useful emigrants the favour of a government which was base enough, after his defeat at Dragonski, to throw Ipsilanti into a dungeon the moment he took shelter within their states.

The only advantage which humanity acquired from the wicked act that overturned the balance of power in the north of Europe, is the suspension, it may be hoped destruction, of those religious animosities, by which the temporal interests of that corner of the Christian world were so long endangered. It is the great glory of the Russian cabinet, that, by the proclamation of Catherine in 1785, religious toleration was established as a cardinal principle in their great division of the Greek Church. The wisdom of the serpent has taught a lesson to the charity of the dove. It is too true, that the practical exercise of this beneficent policy has since been their most useful lever in very secular undertakings. But it has effectually foiled the Sultan. Instead of Mahomedans being always provided with a Christian ally, thirsting to revenge their own insulted altars, it has raised up against Turkish fanaticism the enthusiasm of co-religionists in one great Christian cause. The spectacle presented at Astracan, where the mosque of the Mussulman, the pagoda of the Hindoo, the fire temple of the Parsee, Greek and Latin churches, meet together, in pious acknowledgment of one great Creator and Preserver, is an invaluable outpost to a nation, whose conquering sword bears upon its point the olive branch of religious peace. The most fatal gap through which Mahomedan hordes poured into Christendom, is, we trust, stopped up and for ever. The Sultan lost a hold, stronger than the line of fortresses on the right bank of the Danube, the day that his territory ceased to be a house of refuge to Jews flying from Spanish persecution, and Christians flying from their persecution of each other.

It is impossible to place much reliance upon loose general declamation, when opposed by the evidence of facts. Singular proof, however, does exist, of the Turks being at one time advanced to a degree of military science, considerably beyond their present attainments; as well as (but which is much less remarkable) that their discipline was once far more perfect than that of Europe. 'It is only,' says Jucherau, 'since the establishment of the School for engineers at Sulitzi, that they have learned under Frank officers, in consulting their military archives, and the plans of their ancient engineers, those ways and parallels of trenches, of which they were the inventors, and which so distinguished the siege of Candia.' Busbequius, in 1557, at a period when the fortune of the Ottoman em-

pire was at the height, from which it has ever since been declining, gives a picture of a Turkish camp. Formidable enough in itself, (and very different from almost all subsequent representations,) it was chiefly formidable from the Christian divisions and licentiousness with which it was contrasted. 'When I compare the difference between their soldiers and ours, I stand amazed to think what will be the event; for certainly their soldiers must needs conquer, and ours must needs be vanquished; both cannot stand prosperously together.'—'Can any man doubt, in this case, what the event will be? 'Tis only the Persian stands between us and ruin. The Turk would sail be upon us, but he keeps him back; his war with him affords us only a respite, not a deliverance. When he once makes peace with him, he will bring all the power of the East upon us, and how ready we are to receive him—I am afraid to speak.'—'Besides, there are no drinking matches amongst them, no playing with cards or dice, the bane of the Christian army! I only heard one Hungarian common soldier playing a doleful ditty on an ill-tuned harp, and his companions were howling rather than singing to it; it was the last words of a fellow-soldier, who died of his wounds on the grassy bank of the Danow: he adjured that river, as her streams were gliding to his own country, to commend him to his friends there, and tell them that he died no ignoble nor unrevenged death, for the glory of their nation, and increase of their religion.'—Yet even then, the French ambassador, 'a man of prodigious liberty of speech,' was confident enough to tell the vizier,—'What, do you think that you have got Buda, and other Hungarian towns from the Christians by force? No, I deny it utterly; 'tis our dissension that gave you opportunity to take them. If there had not been continual wars between the Kings of France and Spain, you would have been so far from possessing those towns, that Charles V. would hardly have suffered you to live quiet at Constantinople itself.' The panegyric upon Ferdinand with which Busbequius concludes his Travels confirms this opinion; and is inconsistent with the supposition, that his own alarms were as reasonable as they were well intended. It is strange he should not have arrived at the same conviction; for he expatiates triumphantly on the fact, that Solyman, terrible by his own and his ancestors' successes, was after all stopped by small and new-levied forces. Between twenty-five and thirty thousand foot, with a small number of horse, were found sufficient to maintain their ground against two hundred thousand horse and a veteran infantry. 'It is about forty years since Solyman, in the beginning of his reign,

‘ took Belgrade, slew Lewis, King of Hungary, and thereby promised himself the possession of that and other countries ; in hopes whereof he besieged Vienna, and, renewing the war, he reduced Gonitzium, again threatened Vienna at a distance. But what did he get by this great armament ? He was forced to stick in that part of Hungary which he had already taken.’ He that was wont to conquer great kingdoms by one expedition, now subdued only some weak castles and small towns, which cost him dear. ’Tis true, he saw Vienna once, but never after. It is said, that Solyman wished his life to be prolonged, to see three things finished, viz. : The structure of his temple, a sumptuous and magnificent work ! The repairing of the old aqueducts to bring water into Constantinople ; and the conquest of Vienna. The two first he hath accomplished ; but at the third he sticks, and I hope ever will ; so that he always calls Vienna his ignominy and disgrace.’ Knolles, in his *Brief Discourse on the Greatness of the Turkish Empire*, as it stood in 1623, ought, from his general reasonings, and from the fact which he spreads out before his reader, to have drawn the same conclusion ; but his imagination was inflamed with the tragical story of preceding conquests, in whose narration he had been so long engaged. When we see that such a barbarian force as Timariot or feudal horsemen were the chief strength, and that the main power of the foot lay in the Janissaries, ‘ never in number exceeding 12 or 14,000, yet seldom half so many, even in the greatest armies ;’—moreover, that these too, with their ancient obedience, had lost also a great part of their former valour ; the military reputation of the Ottoman Empire can only be comprehended by keeping constantly in mind the still more contemptible levies by which the pauper sovereigns of Europe arranged their miserable feuds. Nations might certainly show their wealth and civilisation in some wiser form ; but in nothing is the progress more visible than in the amount of unproductive labour, which modern times have been able to let kings appropriate to the regular maintenance of standing armies ; and in the science which has been devoted to improve the resources and the tactics of a campaign. The army on which Francis the First staked all but honour, the navies with which Elizabeth, and Charles the Second, asserted the sovereignty of the seas, would be to-day worthy of scarcely a German contingent, or a third-rate power.

Fear, we think, held the pen much more than reason in most of those earlier calculations, which seem so extraordinary at present. The truer, however, the contemporary estimate may once have been, the more entire and more instructive is the change.

The time was, when Solyman and Charles V. appeared to political alarmists not improbable competitors for universal empire; and when Madrid or Constantinople might have looked to be the capital of the world. Without any great reverses, how are the mighty fallen! What are Spain and Turkey now? Fairly worn out by two centuries of misgovernment, they represent a decayed spendthrift tottering under his tawdry rags into an almshouse, whilst their hale and vigorous rivals are advancing with strengthened frames in a prosperous career. The comparative condition to which Russia has raised, and Turkey sunk herself during the last hundred years,—the one by the adoption, the other by the resistance of all reforms,—is a warning to statesmen of the quiescent and stationary school, to whatever country they may belong. The truth is, a nation cannot stand still. It must go backward or forward. There can be no doubt, accordingly, that Turkey has not only been passed by, but that, in most points, she has absolutely receded, although perhaps not to the full extent that appearances would at first imply. She has suffered in both ways. She is not what she was, Christendom is much greater. The Turks therefore will not do enough by recovering the ground which they have lost; they have to overtake us in the progress which we have made.

This consideration brings us back to the points on which present politics must hinge. Notwithstanding every appearance that such has been the fact, it is yet absolutely incredible that the results of the last campaign should have taken our Foreign Minister by surprise. It would seem to be a principle, that as one brother was to undo every noble action that had been done by Mr Canning the statesman, the first duty of the other was also to disbelieve every honest truth left as a legacy to his successor by Mr Canning the ambassador. Otherwise, the childishness of resolving to credit only what we wish, could never have misled grown-up gentlemen such an unreasonable length. Late events have only published to the coffee-houses what has, for the last hundred years, been notorious to every well-informed enquirer. Count Marsigli told the nations of Europe, in his account of the state of the Ottoman Empire, that they had only to march:—‘their greatest difficulty would be to divide the conquered country.’ The Prince de Ligne, in a Letter from the Crimea, in the summer of 1787, communicated the several points of view in which Joseph, Catherine, and himself, speculated during that celebrated excursion, *sur les pauvres diables des Turcs*. The Prince was for re-establishing *la belle antiquité*; the Empress for raising up Lycurguses. The only difficulty with Joseph, (who was more for the future than

the past, for the positive than for chimeras,) was, '*que diable de faire de Constantinople.*' The policy of Austria (we fear nations have no conscience) is better informed at present; and she now protests (none so solemnly) against visions of this description. Nobody dreams of any general alliance against Turkey for the purpose of the propagation of the Gospel, or for the partition of an infidel dominion. But Russia is sufficiently powerful by herself to force on an answer to that formidable question. The notion that the other states of Europe are to negative for ever such an interrogatory, and guarantee by arms the integrity of the Ottoman empire, is as fine a nursery for endless conferences and campaigns, and as unprincipled an encouragement to misgovernment, as the genius of diplomacy could devise. It is a case in which, after all the breath, the ink, the blood, that may be spent over its argument, the Sultan 'must minister unto himself.' If, on a careful investigation of the causes whence his kingdom has dropped so far behind hand, he can discover and apply a remedial principle, strong enough to renovate its frame, he will then be in a condition to avail himself of whatever aid it might be just and prudent to bestow. But not till then.

We must defer an *exposé* of the vices of Turkish administration to some future occasion. Our present limits will allow us to examine such of the causes only of this avowed national debility, as are supposed to arise expressly out of political institutions. It has been long a prevalent opinion, that a canker of this description was too deeply seated in their frame to be eradicated, or ever seriously probed. In such a case there may be either no specific remedy at all for the disease; or none that the general constitution of the patient is strong enough to bear. The patient, from ignorant despair, or in obstinate presumption, may throw the medicine at the doctor's head, and be found eating opium and smoking his chibouque, when the fatal apparition summons him away. Volney predicted that the mortal agony would come upon its victim in this attitude of repose. 'The Sultan, equally affected with the same ignorance as his people, will continue to vegetate in his palace; women and eunuchs will continue to appoint to offices and places; and governments will be publicly offered to sale. The pashas will pillage the subjects, and impoverish the provinces. The divan will follow its maxims of haughtiness and intolerance. The people will be instigated by fanaticism. The generals will carry on war without intelligence, and continue to lose battles, until this incoherent edifice of power, shaken to its basis, deprived of its support, and losing its equilibrium, shall fall, and astonish the world with another instance of mighty ruin.' This prophecy is refuted, as

far, at least, as the Sultan is personally concerned, by the energy which Mahmood has lately pushed to so ferocious and desperate an extreme. On the contrary, the time and remedy that D'Osson looked forward to so anxiously, seems, in this respect at least, partially arrived. 'To reform the Ottomans, there wants only a superior mind, a sultan prudent, enlightened, enterprising. The power which religion places in his hands,—the blind obedience which it prescribes to his subjects for all things emanating from his authority,—would render the enterprise less hazardous, and its success less doubtful. By the textual disposition of the law, the sovereign has the right of changing at his pleasure the springs of the civil and political administration, and of adopting whatever principles the times, circumstances, and public interest may require. Every thing depends, as may be seen, on a single head! Let a Mahomet the Second, a Selim, or Solyman the First, mount again the throne; let them be seconded by the genius of a Kupergli, &c.; let a Mufti, animated with the same zeal, enter into their views;—then we shall see these same Ottomans, hitherto so concentrated within themselves, and so tyrannized by prejudices, maintain more intimate relations with Europeans; adopt their military system; in fine, change altogether the face of the empire.'

Unfortunately, a constellation of great men is not to be had, at a moment's warning, even on a Sultan's call. Thornton had good reason, therefore, to intimate, that such a combination of reforming virtue in these several stations, might probably never meet. The impediments that would, in the first instance, be ranged against their measures, seem also underrated. In this enquiry, the institution of the Janissaries must be set apart, and kept distinct from the rest of the case. Like a disorder in the heart, or other nobler part, it paralyzed every thing else. If its pernicious influence is duly first considered, and afterwards deducted, the prospect will be more distinct, and also more encouraging. The extreme hazard of any innovation on the Janissary system, had for ages deterred the boldest sultans from beginning the experiment, in the quarter where it was indispensable that it should begin. It is near three centuries ago, since Busbequius wrote from the Turkish camp, the following opinions respecting the Janissaries, as entertained, even at that time, by their great military lawgiver, whose name was a terror over Europe. There had been some scuffle between a party of Janissaries and the ambassador's people. Rustan, the Grand Vizier, hearing of it, 'sent a messenger to me, to desire me to cut off all occasion of dispute with the Janissaries as the worst of men.' 'You know,' (said he,) 'it is a time of war, whereby they may be said to reign, rather than the Sultan,



‘who himself stands in fear of them.’—‘The truth is, though there may be some use of a standing guard and militia, yet there are also many inconveniences attending it, of which this is the chief. Their emperor is very fearful of them, lest, having the sword in their hands, they should alter the government as they pleased, of which there had been many precedents; yet, there are ways, also, whereby this may be prevented.’ Harrington might well believe, that the disease and the remedy were alike fatal, when, nearly a century later, he observed, that ‘the wound in the monarchy, incured and incurable, is the power which the Janissaries have of exciting sedition.’ Kuperkli, the politic Burleigh of that court, was understood to have laid the design for a war with Germany, and to have enjoined its prosecution on his son, with the express object of extirpating the ancient Spahies and Janissaries in the course of it. Thus, in 1664, it was contrived, that the bloodiest part of the slaughter should fall on them, till ‘the valiantest soldiers and best number of their expert captains perished promiscuously, to the great damage and weakening of the Ottoman power.’ The historian proceeds,—‘Notwithstanding that the pride of the Turkish religion is reduced to so low an abatement of their power, and to a condition easily for the future, with good management, to be ruled; yet this present Sultan, Mahomet, still retaining the memory and impression of the amazement he suffered in his infancy, on occasion of a dangerous combination and conspiracy of the Janissaries, will never confide himself to their guard, nor be reconciled to Constantinople, in consideration of the many chambers it contains of that loathed militia, which have been so many nurseries and seminaries of treasons, plotted against himself and his other progenitors.’ Their Prætorian presence and domination during a succeeding century and a half, are sufficient excuse for the Sultan’s apprehensions, that his Viziers might have been thus only enfeebling the kingdom against foreign enemies, without having secured domestic protection to himself.

Two plans were tried with the Janissaries, before the scimitar was called in to cut the knot. According to the first, Selim, that most amiable reformer, the Edward the Sixth of Turkey, endeavoured to raise regular regiments of picked men, and by drafting into them the best soldiers from among the Janissaries, to supersede that ancient corporation by slow degrees. A numerous Divan in vain concurred. The celebrated Hassan, and an enlightened Mufti, were in vain his most zealous coadjutors. They died, to be sure, at a critical period; but the result showed, what little progress the Sultan had made during twelve years, in preparing the public mind. According to the second plan, it was proposed in the

following year by Bairactar, not to substitute other troops in the place of the Janissaries, but to reform the Janissaries themselves. Here again, a Divan, summoned from all parts of the empire, once more concurred, and equally in vain. The Vizier may have been hasty; but the arm, which was strong enough to avenge his master's fall, was found too weak, even under the more vigorous auspices of the present Sultan, to carry into effect any modification of his reforms. 'Such,' says Juchereau, an eye-witness of these scenes, 'was the last result of the attempts which have been made in Turkey, to obtain a regular army. They renounced for ever the military institutions of the Franks, which had caused so many evils. They pronounced an anathema against all who should even mention them. The ancient order of things was entirely re-established. The Janissaries and the Ulemas resumed their rights and their political influence. The Government, acknowledging that the abuses which have brought the decay of the empire, and which will infallibly produce its fall, were too strong to be destroyed, has resumed the system which it had followed for the last hundred years,—that of closing its eyes upon dangers; of speaking only of the past; of occupying itself only with the present; of despising the future, and of calmly waiting the course of the events which are written in the book of destiny.' For more than sixteen successive years, was the fiery Mahmood obliged to champ the bit, conceal his injuries, brood over his plans, and 'hushed in grim repose,' await the moment when he could break to pieces a rusty weapon, that had ceased to wound any but its wearer, and which no art could temper, and no skill could wield.

It is a painful contrast between Juchereau's anticipations of the youthful and generous Prince, and Mr Macfarlane's frowning picture of the full-grown despot. But what else, under the circumstances, could we expect? The severe and gentle virtues, in any case, are of difficult alliance. Mahmood's character is evidently that of Romulus, more than Numa. But an iron nature could alone have gone through the work which was before him. The task also, in itself, could not be an improving one. It may indeed be improbable, that 'these hangman's hands' should be ordained to build a temple unto Peace. The suppression of the Janissaries was, nevertheless, the corner-stone on which a new system must be raised, if it were to be raised at all. They have nothing but their own obstinate ferocity to blame, that this corner-stone could be only laid and cemented in their blood. A reforming sultan cannot help having the thought of Peter the Great for ever present to his mind. The Strelitzes were the Janissaries over again. The Patriarch of Moscow was nothing but a Mufti; and his wrong-headed clergy were Ulemas under another name.

Even poor Selim took him as his model. But Selim was far too good, to be the hero of any tragedy. Mahmood is also a very inferior copy; though inferior in another way. He has given no proof of the genius which can make a pulk of Cossacks a powerful kingdom. There is no wise choice of great ministers, or upright friends; nor is there any resemblance in their virtues. We have seen nothing yet of hard-working and disinterested patriotism. He had no thoughts of going to Saardam. It would appear, that in those higher qualities, so important for the completion of his arduous enterprise, he has personally no pretension to be compared with the hardy monarch who left a throne to educate himself, in order that he might educate his people. Less, it may be hoped, will serve. What he has already done, in abolishing the Turkish Strelitzes, Juchereau pronounced to be so far an undertaking of infinitely greater difficulty than the similar reform in Russia; owing to the facts, that Peter was aided by a powerful party, and his Strelitzes were an isolated body, raised up recently to control the nobles,—illustrious by no victory, sanctified by no religious feeling; whilst Mahmood stood alone, and the Janissaries were intertwined with strong family interests, connected with brilliant recollections, and supported by inveterate prejudices in every class throughout all corners of the empire. In fixity of purpose, and recklessness of means, there is not much to choose between their respective modes of accomplishing their object. Two thousand Strelitzes, butchered and impaled round Moscow, are as picturesque a horror, as twenty thousand Janissaries weltering in their gore in the Etmeidan. A son sacrificed for a nameless and ambiguous crime, is a vigour beyond the law, which stands as much in need of palliation as a brother strangled, lest an unscrupulous opposition should replace him on the throne. Both must be estimated according to Asiatic notions. If the Sultan had succeeded in keeping the Russians at bay a second campaign, we should have heard nothing of his unpopularity for the actions which make him odious in Europe. He would have been, at this moment, half worshipped by a people in whose domestic politics Machiavel and Macbeth would find themselves but children, and with whom it is a matter of religion, to judge solely by the result. In the event of a double miracle,—that is, should his tactics improve, so as to beat the Russians in an even battle, and his subjects improve, so as to read Voltaire in French, they will be able to understand and to apply the following passage. ‘*Les Russes doivent certainement regarder le Czar comme le plus grand des hommes. De la mer Baltique, aux frontières de la Chine, c’est un héros; mais doit-il l’être parmi nous? Était-il comparable pour la valeur à nos Condés, à nos Villars, et pour les connais-*

‘sances, pour l’esprit, pour les mœurs, à une foule d’hommes avec qui nous vivons ? Non, mais il était roi, et roi mal élevé ; et il a fait ce que peut-être mille souverains à sa place n’eussent pas fait. Il a eu cette force dans l’âme, qui met un homme au-dessus des préjugés, et de tout ce qui l’environne, et de tout ce qui l’a précédé ; c’est un architecte, qui a bâti en brique, et qui ailleurs eût bâti en marbre.’

The Sultan has lopped the gangrened limb, when all palliatives that eased the pain had only confirmed the danger. Now that he has paid this dreadful but necessary price of national improvement, it is to be hoped that it will not be paid in vain. In a state of society whose elements are pounded so small, and are whirled round in such constant eddies, the initiative of any general reformation can be expected nowhere but from the government. The government for this purpose may be assumed to be the Sultan. We cannot stop to ask what it is that he will have to do or to undo ; but, simply to make some observations on the preliminary objection, so strongly urged by many writers—that according to the political principle and working of the Turkish constitution, further obstacles still remain ; and that the Sultan’s hands will be so tied up as to leave him without the independent power of doing any thing at all.

A short examination of the constitution, as apparently best delineated, may perhaps enable us to form a rational conjecture, whether the obstacles, which are thus suggested, rest chiefly on constitutional principles, arising from and provided by the forms of government and equivalent customs, or on the mere influence of popular superstitions. The former alone can be peculiar to Turkey. There is no reason to believe that the latter prejudices are stronger among the Turks than in any other Mussulman community. A few more disastrous comparisons with Europe, and a Greek Hayti of free Rayahs at their doors, will go far towards dissipating these last delusions. Enthusiasm makes an admirable beginning for individuals or nations. But by itself it can go only a short way. It must be replaced by habits in the one case, and by institutions in the other. Such institutions have been attributed to Turkey. These have been supposed to explain the fact, that, amidst the ceaseless crash or crumbling of barbaric thrones over the East, the Othman dynasty has not only maintained an uninterrupted succession in the same family, but the undisputed sovereignty of a mixed and enormous empire, during five hundred years. A corresponding reaction, or inert resistance to necessary changes, is now attributed to them. Is either the compliment or the reproach confirmed by investigation ? Was the Ottoman constitution in its

original state so skilfully arranged? To what part of the original construction, or to what deviations and corruptions can the misfortunes of later times be imputed? What (if any thing) is wanting to remodel or adapt it to the emergencies of the present day, when the substantial co-operation of all the parts of an efficient government, whatever may be its form, is absolutely required? The whole policy exhausted in this single example of longevity in an Oriental government, seems to consist in the accident which has interwoven a notion of divine right, or national existence, with the fate of the house of Othman. This appears to be the entire secret which has kept things together since the enthusiasm of conquest expired. Nor will it be seen that any institution has either been purposely planned, or has casually grown up, 'chance-sown by the fountain,' to serve as a regular check against the ordinary abuse of power; or, as a help in the direction of its efforts to promote the public good. Whatever authority the only recognised body now remaining (that of the Ulemas) possesses, does not appear to be derived from its corporate form, privileges, or wealth, so much as from the direct religious influence of its members, as the depositaries and interpreters of the divine law, over a bigoted community. We can find in the constitution of Turkey, either past or present, no evidence of any intermediate title, under which private interests have procured established rights, of such a nature as need clash with the success of D'Ohsson's panacea—a spirited administration according to the strict principles of the Mohamedan law. It is the more incumbent on the Sultan to consecrate the late terrible reaction, perpetrated by him on his Prætorian Guards, to this solemn purpose. It must be made the commencement not only of an emancipation from an overruling thralldom, but of a system of vigorous internal improvement; or it will be no doubtful question of vindictive patriotism, but a bloody crime. The Ulemas may of late have, in their own defence, usually sided with the Janissaries, as with the strongest party. A comparison of the nature of the royal authority with that of the Ulemas, will tend to show, how far it is probable that the government will henceforward fairly be entitled to make this body answerable for their perseverance in a course of vicious administration.

The cardinal maxim of the Ottoman constitution is simple enough. It is that of absolute monarchy in the Padishaw or Sultan—limited by the Koran and the Mufti—not more in theory or fact than Ferdinand is limited by the Gospels and the Pope. Its history establishes most clearly the following points—that the principle is pure despotism; that its exercise has been radically

enfeebled by the worse than monastic restraint of mind and body under which the personal character of their sovereigns has been stunted; that the supremacy of the Othman family is maintained by a singular superstition; but that no reverence of religion belongs *individually* to the sovereign on the throne. When Thornton, therefore, grounds the decay of the empire on despotism, as cause and effect, it could not be his meaning to describe under that word the principle of arbitrary power as a novelty which was chargeable with these consequences. This principle is as old as the empire, nor was it ever loosened. He probably intended a vague reference to that particular and fatal species of Oriental misrule which had so long prevailed, and whose nature it is to become worse and worse. It had been a complicated mal-administration,—the exercise of which indeed implies absolute power; the possibility of which is a conclusive objection against such a form of government; but which experience elsewhere shows to be by no means inseparably connected with its existence. There are periods, if not stages in society, when despotism appears a necessary evil. Some time must have elapsed, before the Indians, who found their first Dutch visitors so incomprehensible in nothing as in the information that they were not governed by a king, would have been much benefited by being presented with a House of Commons. In the present instance, Mahmood is not likely to volunteer any surrender of his despotic power. He will be disposed to wait the experiment in Egypt. It is the advice of Juchereau that, as the first reform, he should recover into his own hands the reins which had, on some occasions, been seized upon by others. D'Ohsson, again, dates all the calamities of the empire from the day when, by a wretched policy, its future governors were deprived of every chance of learning the arts by which even a despotism might have been firmly and prudently administered. According to these views, the despotism became intolerable when, in one case, it was thus divided but not diminished; in the other, was stupified instead of having been enlightened. The rebellion of his grown-up sons led Solyman the First to forbid them the capital; and to set the example of confining ever afterwards the princes of the royal family within the walls of the seraglio.

If the cause assigned by D'Ohsson were alone sufficient to account for all the evil consequences which he deduces from it, the mere emancipation of the young princes from a degrading imprisonment would, of itself, restore the Ottoman nation. It is grossly improbable that a man who is a state prisoner from his cradle to his coronation, should make a great king. The publicity with which Mahmood has brought his children for-

ward, unveiled his daughters, and familiarised them with daylight, must help to destroy the prejudice on which this debasing practice has been continued. The Janissaries considered themselves as trustees of the lives of the minor branches of the reigning Sultan ;—not only by way of security against his jealousy, but also as security for what they chose to regard his good behaviour. Now that the trustees are dead, this cowardly maxim should die with them. The King of Persia, with a family like Priam's, has twelve sons governors of provinces. The race from whom the Ottoman sovereigns alone can spring, must have an equal chance of being, by their education, qualified for the duties which they one day may be called on to discharge. It is the beauty of a constitution that it reduces to the least possible importance, the personal character of the sovereign himself. That the King shall be able to do no wrong, is its first care and caution ; for, unfortunately, the world has had too long experience that kings, for whom no education could be good enough, are almost sure to be the worst educated persons in their dominions. It is a melancholy consideration, accordingly, that in Turkey, where, as his power was most absolute, the necessity of preparation for his awful duties was the most required, it should have been made, for three hundred years, a first principle of state policy, that the King should be just as much incapacitated for a prudent government of his subjects as the *Kislar-Aga* for keeping up the royal race.

When old Kupergli surrendered the office of Grand Vizier into the hands of Mahomet IV. in 1661, there were three things which he particularly recommended to his Majesty : first, never to give ear to the advice of women ; secondly, to amass all possible treasure, not minding the oppression ; thirdly, to be continually on horseback, and keep his armies in constant action. If the first and last of these recommendations had been attended to rather than the second, the last Kupergli would never have been tempted into the heresy of declaring, that, since all the successors of Solymán had been fools or tyrants, it was time to abolish the race. D'Ohsson's suggestion of improving their education, is much easier, and will do as well. The diseased races of the intermarrying kings of Europe may get worn out. But there is no family upon earth, where, in the maternal line, a more uniform infusion of healthy plebeian blood has been faithfully kept up. Practice has made it almost a rule of law, for which various reasons are assigned,—as the insult on Bajazet's wife by Tamerlane, the expense of dower, the risk of dangerous alliances,—that the Sultan cannot marry. Selim's mother was a Circassian slave. Among all the superstitions with which the

Osmanli imagination swarms, none is more deeply-rooted than the belief that the fortune of the empire, and that of the house of Othman, are indissolubly bound up together. This very singular people felt no difficulty in making very free with the person of individual sultans, as long as there was a male grown-up member of the family ready to succeed him. But they have no notion of the possibility of being governed by a Queen or a Regent. There are religious difficulties respecting the power of a minor to constitute deputies for religious service: and every scruple on this point has been inflamed by the misfortunes that befell the empire during the minority of Mahomet IV. However, the family tree has been pruned almost too close. Fear and cruelty have been so successful in the hereditary precautions which would bear no brother near the throne for successive generations, that, beyond Mahmood and his children, the sacred blood is not publicly and clearly recognised as flowing in any living veins. In this lonely title Mahmood has found, and finds his safety. The same reverential awe, which has for ages clung round his family, is now all vested in his own person. It is true, the disasters of the late campaigns must impede him in his schemes; but in the present condition of the family, no calamity apparently will cause him to be disowned, as one against whom Providence has declared; for the empire would be in the state of a hive whose queen bee was missing.

During an effeminate government of eunuchs, and of sultans more effeminate than eunuchs, the usurpation of the throne by a subject has never been attempted, nor, except in one instance, even surmised. The surmise, indeed, appears to be nothing but a vindictive calumny on the insolent Grand Vizier last defeated before Vienna. The rumour of the Tartar title, in the Ex-Khans of the Crimea, to the succession in remainder, (however fabulous their relationship,) is more practically kept alive. Bairactar, amid his contempt both of the fury of the mob and the intrigues of the seraglio, could carry his views of possible personal aggrandisement no farther than a message to Selim Gueray, as a warning to the people, that, in default of the young prince, whose life was in his power, he could find in the descendant of Genghis Khan a grateful master, whom they must obey. Mr Macfarlane mentions another claim now circulating on behalf of the family of a certain Mulla Hunkiar. It seems to be of very recent and most ignorant origin; for rumour added a right on the part of its actual chief to gird on the imperial sabre at the ceremony corresponding to a coronation. This right every book on the subject that we ever saw, gives (and truly) to the Mufti; and must be a matter of as much public notoriety as any similar claim at the





more personal inviolability than, during the chief part of the three centuries which have succeeded to this supposed acquisition of a divine authority. Previously, when Mahomet II. made the Mufti chief of the Ulemas, he had in himself sufficient papal prerogatives to confer on his own law officer, and out of his own plenary discretion, the title of the ancient Caliphs—Chief of the Faith. By the letter of the Koran, the Caliphate is limited to the family of the Prophet. How little that restriction is attended to in fact, is proved by the pedigrees of the families which have filled the thrones of Constantinople, Shiraz, and Delhi. The doctrine of Zoussoul, which consecrates the sovereign power in whatever hands may possess the sword, is so thoroughly recognised in practice, that, Mr Harrington observes, the law doctors in Hindostan are found rather too forward than too backward in extending the Mahommedan definition of rebellion, in case any resistance is apprehended to the Christian Caliphate of the Company trading to the East Indies. A spiritual descent is accordingly by no means necessary to the full exercise of Mussulman sovereignty. The King of Persia is plainly no less king than the Turkish Sultan; and he is not conceived to make any similar pretensions. Whatever may be supposed to be, on such a point, the more correct interpretation of the written text; it is, as a question of fact only, that the existence and application of the religious sanction can be of the least practical importance. A Sultan is strangled from time to time, almost as the ordinary way in which nature relieves itself under the Ottoman constitution. But the person and property of a Ulema are sacred. Two conquerors, Selim I. and Amurath IV., put to death a suspected Mufti. The janissaries sacrificed another in the reign of Mustapha II. But this was one whom the Ulemas had excommunicated on the charge of infidelity; and whose corpse they delivered over to be insulted by the indignity of a Christian burial performed by a Greek priest. They had also previously appointed another to his pontificate. Whoever compares these respective bills of mortality will see—on one side, the young princes of the royal house disposed of with less consideration than a litter of blind puppies, and the bowstring for ever hovering over a Sultan's head; whilst, on the other, the story of the marble mortar, where contumacious Muftis, whose blood could not be spilt, might yet properly enough be pounded, seems nothing but an obscure and popular tradition. It is impossible not to feel where, in this case, the religious sanction lies.

Along with a principle of Divine right, so fortified by the particular circumstances of the case, nothing but a direct share in the legislative and executive power could establish any other

independent authority, which can be constitutionally and effectually opposed to it. Nevertheless, the Ottoman government has been long considered not simply as an absolute monarchy, but also as a species of military theocracy. If the expression merely means that the Sultan pre-eminently possesses the power of the sword,—moreover, acts as the shadow and vicegerent of God, ‘whose minister he is,’ it means nothing very characteristic, and is only strongly descriptive of his sway. In case any important quality or limitation is here designed, it must be presumed, that by the word ‘military,’ more is understood than the historical fact, that the Empire was established by force of arms, or its military duties subsequently maintained, by a scale of territorial liabilities precisely analogous to Knight service under our feudal system. By the word, ‘theocracy,’ more also, on this supposition, must be understood than the general instructions relating to political and civil administration contained in the Koran; since a military theocracy, so interpreted, does not of necessity imply any qualification of the monarchical power. In a constitutional sense, the expression, if it means any thing, can only point at the two institutions of the Janissaries and the Ulemas; and to the power of political interference and combination, which they were long in the habit of exercising. Of these the first was military. The second, at least the efficient part of it, like the Jewish Scribes or Canonists, will appear to be a body claiming both magisterial and ecclesiastical authority. It may be premised, that no Turk who can read his Koran, or can enquire into the state of the Mahomedan religion, as it existed in any country before the Ottoman constitution was framed, or as it has since existed in Persia or India, can be so misled as to believe that any question concerning the corporation of either Janissary or Ulema is, in itself, necessarily a religious question. The opposition against which a Sovereign may be called to contend, probably will not be the less formidable at first, because it is founded on a mistaken prejudice, or on corrupt partialities, than if it were based on the soundest reasoning. It is clear, however, that the more the Sultan can succeed in drawing public attention to the question, and the better it is understood, the less difficulty will a pious Mussulman feel in admitting, that as the institutions both of Janissaries and Ulemas, are merely Turkish and not Mahomedan, and were introduced solely on grounds of public advantage, the propriety of their continuance ought, from time to time, to be tried by that common test. The alliance between these two bodies grew out of their mutual interest in protecting the unconstitutional encroachments of each other against the ordi-

nary government. The Ulemas gave the Janissaries the sanction of the law. The Janissaries gave the Ulemas the secular assistance of the sword. The Ulemas would find it just as difficult to make good by legal argument a claim that they themselves should be consulted, and the *fetva* of their Mufti received as binding, on any affairs of Government, as the Janissaries to prove the right of learning no manœuvres, and marching in no direction, but such as they should think fit. Juchereau regards this confederacy as having effected a complete alteration in the ancient constitution of the state; and as having frequently sacrificed its interests to their own private views. 'The Ottoman Empire, of which all the institutions are essentially theocratic and military, and which cannot be strong but when its chief is strong also, has seen its weakness and decay grow out of the enfeebling of the sovereign authority.' These expressions imply, that the Sultan who should succeed in recovering his sovereign authority from these competitors, would, by that fact alone, remove the causes of weakness and decay. The confederacy has been dissolved by the annihilation of its most prominent partner. Considering the preponderating difficulty of that half of the supposed impossibilities which Mahmood has already overcome, we suspect no further question will arise with the survivor. This must principally depend on two points. First, how far it is likely that the Ulemas, now they stand alone, will offer any serious obstacle to salutary innovations proposed by Mahmood or his successors. Secondly, in case they should persist to fight their old battle, single-handed, what are their probable means of successful opposition? That is, first, what is their interest? Next, what is their power?

Both questions will be best answered, by ascertaining of whom the Ulemas consist;—what privileges they possess, and what interests they represent? Ottoman words, which describe civil and military offices, are generally of Turkish, whilst those describing religious offices are of Arabic derivation. The word *Effendee* is Turkish, and means master or superior. It covers nearly as wide a space as the term 'gentleman' in English; since, a beggar in Constantinople applies it to the Frank, whose alms he solicits in the street. *Ulema* is Arabic; and signifies, a learned man. Now Dr Russel, in explaining the composition of the different classes of society at Aleppo, says, 'The Effendees compose the body of the Ulema.' Afterwards, in describing the different members who constitute the Divan of that great town, he mentions the Effendees as a class entitled to attend,—whose power was still very great, and often very useful in controlling that proconsular tyrant, the triennial Pasha, especially

since the decay of the Agas or renters of land. It would appear, that every Ulema will, as such, be an Effendee; but, that a man may be an Effendee (as Reis Effendee, &c.) without being a Ulema. This body, as it exists in Constantinople and in the provinces, will be formed in the main on the same principles, differing only in the importance of their situations. Its members consist of three orders, which, from the nature of the Mahommedan religion, are all theological—the two first being legal; the last strictly ecclesiastical. The first comprises those professors of law generally, who have graduated as doctors in the science: of these the Mufti, whether in the capital or the provinces, is the chief. Their peculiar authority is confined to teaching or expounding the law. The cases laid before them, accordingly, are abstract propositions, expressed in general terms. Their *fetva* or opinion is equally general. The particular application in any given case rests in other hands. If it be political, the Janissaries have applied it to authorize the deposition of the Sultan; the Sultan again, to authorize either a war or a peace,—the butchery of the Janissaries, or the changing the bonnets of the Ulemas into a felt cap. If it be judicial, the Cadi adopts it, when it suits his purpose: in case it does not, he makes out some specialty in the facts before him. The second order, comprises the magistrates who administer the law and fill most of the seats of justice. The last consists of the clergy, who merely perform the ceremonial duties of the Church.\*

---

\* In the account given of the constitution of the Ulemas, we have chiefly followed Juchereau. Considering his frequent references to D'Ohsson, it is no extravagance of confidence to suppose, wherever a difference between their statements is observed, that some alteration of practice has intervened. It may be right, however, to mention, that D'Ohsson expressly states, there is nothing in the organisation of this body which prevents its members from passing out of one department into another. 'Every Sheik or Imam may aspire to the office of Mufti of a province, or to that of Cadi and of Mollah, and history offers more than one example; especially in latter times.' On another point, he says, Solyman I. gave the Mufti of the capital precedence over the Cadis; but that in other respects, and in the provinces, the ministers of justice have a marked pre-eminence over the other two classes. The power, however, that the Sultans have thus exercised in derogation of a rule stated otherwise to be as old and as general as the empire, is no slight symptom of the recognised prerogative in the crown. According to D'Ohsson, also, the principle of advancement by seniority was never as substantially acted upon, even as at present, until the reforms under Mustapha II. He details the incidental modes by which the income of different members of the corporation is arranged;—small honoraries, pre-

Any Mussulman may become a Ulema. The young noviciates enter together into the colleges annexed to the principal mosques. They branch off afterwards, according to their patience, ambition, or connexions. The students of least promise are chosen for the service of the church. Their course of instruction is the shortest and most commonplace. Once drafted off into this department, they cannot pass into the others; with the exception of the two chaplains of the seraglio, who, together with the Sultan's tutor, physician, and astrologer, are ex-officio members of the highest class of the first order. Every mosque has its own revenue. The salary of the different persons employed in its respective duties is charged upon it. These are not extravagant; for, whilst Dr Carlisle states the annual income of a Greek officiating Papa at L.26, he quotes that of an Iman at L.4 only. It would seem, therefore, that the Church of Turkey stands quite as much in need as the Church of England of a curate's act, (whenever it passes, we trust it will be administered in a less prevaricating and simoniacal spirit,) to protect its inferior clergy against the arrangements of their richer brethren. The working clergy have indeed been so effectually depressed by the dignitaries of the Ottoman Establishment, that when the Ulemas are spoken of, the two other classes seem alone

---

sents, power of quartering themselves upon, or of selling, lucrative offices in their disposal, &c. The immunity from taxes is described as accumulating the great fortunes in the principal families of these magistrates. D'Ohsson, however, evidently considers respect for religion as the basis of their influence. 'This is the reason why in all times the princes who were most feeble or most devout have made it a duty to caress these magistrates.' Thus the help of the secular arm has been at all times indispensable. 'A perfect accord between the Mufti and the Grand Vizir may support them both for a length of time: but the least misunderstanding may precipitate their fall by enabling intriguers to ruin them in the Sultan's opinion.' Experience sufficiently proves by how frail a tenure they hold offices conferred nominally for life. Notwithstanding also the ordinary practice to the contrary, experience evinces this further point—that it depends on the personal character of the Sultan, whether he reclaims his political independence. Since D'Ohsson, whilst admitting that the 'meneés sordes des gens de loi n'ont pas peu contribué à la deposition de divers Sultans, et à ces troubles qui ont si souvent desolé l'empire,' admits this to be the case historically, as a question of fact—as one of law, it is still clearer: 'au reste, ni la religion, ni la loi, ni la constitution politique de l'empire n'imposent au monarque l'obligation de se prémunir d'un *Fetvo* sur les objets qui concernant l'administration publique.'

to be generally understood. But, under the circumstances described, it is a strange inaccuracy in Mr Madden, to say there is no Church Establishment. It is not the less an Establishment because of the different classes into which its members and duties are divided; and because duties which in other countries are strictly secular, have the misfortune to be made mainly religious duties here, under the imposture of a divinely revealed law. If he had said, that there was no supposition equivalent to the construction given to holy orders; that is, no transmission of divine influence by the imposition of hands from the time of Mahomet,—no personal consecration to an indelible character, he would have been correct. However, the spiritual monopoly is as vigorous as in Europe over the space it covers; and is more extensive, as it includes the lawyers. It is also exercised more intelligibly by means of expulsion, than by a compulsory detainer, which should insist,—once a Ulema always a Ulema, as once a Priest always a Priest. They seek to preserve their exclusive spirit, not by refusing to surrender back to the profane duties of society unwilling or unworthy members, but by declaring that the accepting any office, except of an ecclesiastical or judicial nature, is a disqualification *de facto* and for ever. The rank of the last of the above three orders,—that of a minister of religion, is not only last in the scale, but lowest. His business appears to be considered ministerial only. So that no ecclesiastic can discharge the duties of a lawyer, by either expounding or administering the law; but every lawyer may perform divine service when he is so disposed. Rycaut too readily persuaded himself that the Iman, or churchman, was dependent on the government, or vizir, and that there was no hierarchy to rule amongst them; in order that he might draw a parallel at home. ‘The manner of their designation to the religious office, the little difference between the clergy and the laity, and the manner of their single government in parochial congregations, may not unhappily seem to square with the Independency in England, from which original pattern and example our sectaries and fanatic reformers appear to have drawn their copy.’ The revenues of the royal mosques are left, it is true, to a rather profane superintendence, that of the black eunuch. In other respects, the Mufti, according to Juchereau, keeps a tight hold on the consciences and subservience of the priesthood, by retaining the gift of all ecclesiastical employments in his own disposal. On the two most striking occasions—on the accession of the Sultan, and on his decease—the right even of officiating is also exclusively in the Mufti.

Since the root and principle of the Mahommedan code is

equally divine in its several branches, whether civil, political, or ritual, the character of the Ulemas is not the less decidedly of a religious nature, because the influence of the body is chiefly concentrated and expressed in its two higher orders;—in those to whom the specific application or general interpretation of the law as distinguished from the performance of its religious rites is reserved. Captiousness, or confusion, has made Thornton denounce ‘as an error of the first consequence,’ the representation that the Ulemas, as ministers of religion, exercise control over the minds of men, still more unlimited than that of the Christian clergy in the darkest ages. The one common origin of their law extends the same superstitious feeling (whatever it may be) to the person of the Mufti who comments, and the Cadi who decides on it, as to the Muezzin who calls to prayers, or the Iman who reads them. Thus, Thornton himself, within a few pages, proceeds to explain how, ‘when goaded on by a turbulent soldiery against an irresolute prince, the holy clamour of the gentlemen of the *Ulema* may have increased the uproar of insurrection;’ at the same time that, ‘an ancient prejudice, founded on the respect due to religion and its ministers protects individuals of this order from judicial inflictions entailing infamy or dishonour.’ The student whose talents or interest lead him to aspire to higher ultimate preferment than the mere attendance upon a mosque, works onward to the degree of Mulazzim. This entitles him to hold the minor judicial situations as principal or deputy. More time and more examinations will enable the Mufti to promote the mulazzim to the degree of mudert, or doctor—the highest rank. By favour, the Sultan gets occasionally the children of a Vizier admitted to a doctorate *per saltum*. The children of the principal Mollahs also, are admitted, and by right—sometimes as young as ten years old. The subsequent advancement, takes place through the early stages by seniority only; so that these boy doctors, naturally surviving their colleagues, who had graduated by due course of learned apprenticeship, have founded a sort of hereditary official aristocracy in this powerful corporation, like some of the old magistracy families of France.

The doctors of the capital can, as doctors, only expound the law. But their pre-eminence authorizes them to administer the law also in the character of Mollahs, or judges of the chief cities; the monopoly of which powerful appointments they consequently preserve in their own hands. Indeed, these elders appear to have made nearly the same municipal division that Courts of Aldermen contrive to establish against freemen, or liverymen, in the unlearned corporations of Europe. They are divided into ten



classes, among which the first is supreme. It consists of one hundred members. The Mollah, or judge of a great city, is, by law, obliged to be changed every year. The cadiaskers, or military judges of Romelia and Anatolia, are the leading members of this body; and have, in their respective districts, the appointment of the cadis, or judges of lesser towns. These lesser judges are replaced every year and a half. The Mufti (and this is stated to be an encroachment) must be chosen either from the actual or former cadiaskers, or from ex-muftis. The Ulemas of the provinces are excluded from the great offices of the profession. They can become at most provincial Muftis. The opinion-trade to which a mufti, as such, is restrained, can have little political range or excitement in the local squabbles of a country town. This trade is never one of profit; for these opinions, whether given by Muftis or by simple Ulemas, are given gratis, or nearly so. As to rank, their Constantinopolitan brethren have taken care that the Mollah, or judge (one of themselves, and sent down from the capital) shall take precedence. It is only during his year of judicial service, that a Ulema makes money directly by his profession. Even when judge, he has no salary; but is paid by bribes from one or both of the suitors, and by a perquisite of ten per cent on the sum in dispute; which (iniquitously enough) is levied on the successful party. The ex-cadi becomes again a simple Ulema, and is reduced to the bare privileges of his order. These are, security of person from either capital or infamous punishment; and security of property from confiscation;—immunities, either of which, in Turkey, it is difficult to overrate.

As parties plead their own cause, legal fortunes are made on the bench only, and not at the bar. The dignitaries of the law, once enriched by the nepotism of office, are thus enabled to continue their fortunes in their families. One can easily conceive, in a country where wealth is exposed to such terrible vicissitudes, that the only species of property which is safe from arbitrary spoliation, may in time become considerable. By comparison, it will appear more so. Juchereau is constantly dwelling on the wealth and influence of the Ulemas: he is also very particular in stating, that it is studiously appropriated to the law-department of the order. It is difficult to believe that the private property accumulated by these means in individual families can be raised to any formidable amount. From the manner in which the corporate property, that stands in the name of the order, is said to be settled and accounted for, it is equally difficult to found any overpowering authority thereon, in the magistrates or Ulemas, as managers or trustees. Juchereau esti-

mates, that, at the present day, two-thirds of the land in Turkey is settled in mortmain on the mosques. If it is implied that the power and consequence which must follow the possession of two-thirds of the fee-simple of the soil are lodged in the Ulemas, it ought to have been shown by what channel it is conveyed to them. For, in that case, the surplus profits must be a common fund, under the general distribution of the corporation, or divided out into shares among its members. Rycaut mentions, that the calculation of mosque property was one-third of the empire in his time. Now, it appears, elsewhere, expressly, that this property is in no respect that of the Ulemas. The superintendence only of the two imperial mosques is given to the Mufti. That of the rest is intrusted to other hands; and the surplus of the receipts (after the expenses of maintaining the mosque and its servants are defrayed,) is paid, not to the Ulemas legal or ecclesiastical, but into the public treasury. Moreover, in this sweeping estimate, no distinction is taken between two very different kinds of interests;—both of which would appear, on a superficial statement, to be equally and entirely the property of the church;—namely, that which we have just described; and that where an entail on the descendants of the original proprietor has yet to run. In our own early history, smaller proprietors often sought, in the same manner, and from the same reasons, the protection of wealthier barons, or of the church. The danger of confiscation, to which mere family property was exposed, has led many persons to settle their estate upon a mosque. Thus, once consecrated to God, it is subject neither to forfeiture nor alienation. The original owner takes it back immediately, paying a nominal rent only to the mosque; and with this further condition, that the mosque is to enter on the fee-simple, whenever his issue are extinct. Under such a system, the real and nominal property of a mosque are two very different things. Whatever this mosque property may be, no connexion seems established between it and the Ulemas of any class; much less between it and the legal body only. Yet it is in the legal portion of the firm, that its whole influence is so thoroughly vested, that the ecclesiastical office is universally represented to be as poor and unregarded as that of a parish sexton, or chapel clerk.

We cannot observe any thing in the constitution or the privileges of the Ulemas, or in the nature of their wealth and influence, that should make them necessarily the inveterate enemies of their sovereign, and obstinate opposers of reform. Juchereau, however, considers them as such throughout his book. It is their interest in ignorance which has roused and directed every resistance to improvement; and the Janissaries are prin-

cipally described as being only the blind instruments of their sacerdotal policy. His expressions on this point are so much stronger than the language of other well-informed writers, or than any evidence that he has adduced, that we cannot but suspect the correctness of his observation to have been insensibly biassed by the horror of priests and priestcraft, which a Frenchman would so readily carry out with him from Paris.

The Mufti and the Ulemas encouraged printing. The Koran was alone excepted, upon a silly enough objection to be sure, but certainly not from any wish to keep it out of the hands of the laity. The people preferred their MS. or their pipe. The copyers, too, raised the usual clamour against the introduction of machinery, which would supersede their fingers. The Janissaries, in their last revolt against innovations, destroyed press and paper-mill, as being connected with a system brought forward against themselves. It was not the Muftis who stood in the way of military reform. Juchereau himself, when mentioning that few of the soldiers use the bayonet, adds, 'although the *fetvas* of the Muftis have recognised the utility of this weapon, which having been adopted by the *nizam-gedittes*, has almost entirely disappeared since their abolition.' It is a singular point rather to ask a law opinion on—that of a bayonet. Selim II. had been supported by the Mufti throughout his reign. The successor who turned round on him and betrayed him, was exiled by Mahmood so soon afterwards, and at so critical a period, that it seems clear there was among the Ulemas either no sense of common interest, or the overwhelming apprehension of a thorough want of power. Thornton declares the notion entertained by De Tott and others, that there is a necessary rivalry of interests between the Ulemas and the Sultan to be perfectly 'inconceivable.' He is equally positive against the further observation of Sir James Porter, that the rival interest is backed up by so much strength, as to constitute a balance of power. If it were so, unfortunately it would not be in any way connected with the interests of the great body of the people. Whether this power has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished, are subjects on which there is as usual so great a contrariety of opinion, that the writers might be supposed to contradict each other for the mere pleasure of contradiction. The truth seems to be, that even in times past, the Mufti, whom we may assume to be their representative, has been insolent or submissive, according as the sovereign was feeble or resolved. Since the Janissaries have fallen, the terms of this supposed political equation are entirely changed. A power will be transmitted by Mahmood into the hands of his weakest successor,

more than the strongest of his predecessors has ventured for centuries to claim. For himself at present, although damaged by reverses, (and worst of all by pecuniary difficulties,) he now disposes of a Mufti apparently with as little ceremony as Elizabeth threatened to unfrock a recalcitrating Bishop. Among his haughty ancestors, he will find authority enough for requiring an opinion by way of warrant, caution, or facility—for neglecting to require it at all—for over-ruling it, if opposed to his views—and for even banishing the offender who has demurred about truckling to his will. The late Mufti could not bring himself to compel his brother lawyers to doff the honours of their *quasi*-wig, and walk in a procession with military caps on. A successor was found who made no objections, and the lawyers are now marching in very good array, and can probably by this time look at themselves in a glass without laughing. Mr MacFarlane predicted that Mahmood would find the *Ciaouh* of the Ulemas of more difficult digestion than the bonnet of the Janissaries. Now that it is devoured, he still contends that ‘the typical force of the allusion remains.’ We suspect that he over-rates the former as much as he seems to have under-rated the latter power. If the wealth of the Mosque is in the way, or is wanted for good purposes, England, in the time of Henry VIII., and of Cardinal Wolsey, was not very unlike what Turkey is with its Sultan and his Vizier. That church-property is held in trust for the public, is a doctrine which even a Turk and Soonite can be made to comprehend. The Schyite Persian has acted on it already. Foster, in his Travels, gives the following account of the reformation in this respect, achieved by Nadir Shah, after he had acquired a secular title to the gratitude of the Persians, by driving out the Afghans: ‘Nadir Shah, contrary to the general character of the Persians, who are impressed with a more persecuting spirit than any other Mahomedan nation, gave a common toleration to the worship of the inhabitants, whether Christians, Hindoos, or Jews, and largely retrenched the power and wealth of the priests, who, during the latter period of the Suffuee dynasty, had engrossed the chief direction of government. That Nadir might incapacitate their revenge for the death of the *Mollah Bashi*, (high priest,) who had been executed for refusing assent to a plan of this prince for introducing the Sooni religion into Persia, and to accomplish other salutary purposes, he demanded an account of the vast revenues which had been assigned to the Church. They informed him, according to the tenor of Frazier’s relation of this event, that their property was applied to the uses for which it had been allotted—in salaries for the priests, in the mainte-

' nance of numerous colleges and mosques, in which prayers were  
' incessantly offered up for the success of the arms of the prince,  
' and of the prosperity of the Persian empire. Nadir observed  
' to them, that experience had manifested the inutility of their  
' prayers; since, for the space of fifty years past, the nation had  
' been verging to decay, and ultimately had been reduced, by  
' invasions and rebellion, to a state of ruin, when God's victo-  
' rious instruments (pointing to his army) had come to its relief,  
' and were now ready to sacrifice their lives to its defence and  
' glory;—that the wants of these poor priests, his soldiers, must  
' be supplied, and he therefore determined that the greatest por-  
' tion of the church lands should be appropriated to their use.  
' The mandate being immediately carried into execution, produ-  
' ced a revenue equal to three million of sterling money. The  
' priests, enraged at this assumption, exerted their utmost abili-  
' ties in stirring up the army and the people against the Shah;  
' but the former being composed, in a large proportion, of the  
' Sooni sect, ridiculed their situation; and the body of the inha-  
' bitants, when they considered that the edict would liberate  
' them from a part of the general taxation, were not dissatisfied.  
' Nadir Shah having accomplished this purpose, ordered the at-  
' tendance of the chiefs of the people, and, making a formal de-  
' claration of the measure which had been adopted, told them,  
' if they wanted priests, they must provide them at their own  
' charge; that having himself little occasion for their services,  
' he would not contribute to their maintenance.' (Foster's *Jour-  
ney*, vol. ii. p. 268.)

Nothing can show more strongly, that the power of the Ule-  
mas, whether in Persia or in Turkey, is a power not derived  
specifically from any constitution, but founded generally on re-  
ligion, and accordingly resting on public opinion, than a fact,  
of which we have been assured on competent authority; namely—  
that notwithstanding the distinction that the Ulemas in Persia  
are not formally incorporated as in Turkey, nor have been ac-  
customed to interfere with their *fatvas* in pure political ques-  
tions—nevertheless, the royal authority would at present meet a  
similar opposition in both countries to any undertaking of a re-  
ligious nature, which should rouse the Ulemas religiously into  
action. In case they had just occasion to call on the people in  
the name of religion, it is as likely that his very women and  
children would desert over from the Sophy as from the Sultan,  
to the cause that was represented to be the cause of God. A  
prudent government may attain all reasonable objects without  
bringing matters to so terrible a crisis. The Hindoo princes  
maintained their independent pre-eminence over a body much

more formidable—the sacred family of the Bramins—by a prudent use (in the management of the revenue and of the sword) of the hopes and fears, the rewards and punishments, of this world, against the Braminical distribution of reversionary interests in the next.

We must stop. If, on any future occasion, we undertake to inform the Sultan in what particular manner he ought to mould and exercise the power, which, as far as we can make out, we understand him both *de jure* and *de facto* to possess, we promise to make up in boldness and sincerity whatever we may want in knowledge. Although we do not mean to insist on his changing the pedigree of his people, or even their religion, or on his turning the ladies of his Harem out into the street, he has more to do, nevertheless, than any of his own subjects might like to tell him,—and, unfortunately, much of a different sort from any thing that he has yet attempted. There are instants, however, which contain the weight of years, and which are as valuable to reformers, as the lucky moment to an astrologer. The Sultan must seize them before the enemy is again thundering at his gate. We wish him well, principally for his people's sake, but partly for his own; for, notwithstanding atrocities that would have brought any king in Europe to the gallows, we think that he has been hardly dealt with by our travellers; and that the fair allowances have not been made him, to which, from his education, his position, and the horrible system of former ages, (the most dreadful of all earthly inheritances,) he is entitled, not only in charity, but justice. The period seems, however, nearly come, beyond which the most liberal and christian construction of Turkish customs—such as Extortion, Perfidy, and Murder, ought not to extend. The Reis Effendee dancing, and the Pasha of Egypt summoning a representative council, are signs of the times, and more than the first step in the march of intellect over the East. Mahmood has personally redeemed himself from the imputation of being averse to innovations. We hope yet that we shall live to hear, that he considers it to be the duty of a government to protect its subjects against other miseries, as much as against foreign subjugation;—that he has learned English, and takes in the *Edinburgh Review*.

**ART. VIII.—*Remarks on the Spirit Duties.* Pp. 49. Lond. 1829.**

**WE** are glad that the public attention is now steadily directed to the subject of the Malt and Beer Duties and the Licensing System. There is none of the kind of greater importance ; and we hope that Parliament will at length apply itself in good earnest to root out the abuses connected with the manufacture and sale of beer,—to render the duties on it reasonable and impartial in their operation—to protect the public revenue—the interests of agriculture, and the health and morals of the public, from the destructive effects of fiscal rapacity and ignorance. It is unnecessary, however, to enter into any argument upon topics which we so lately discussed. So far as we know, no one has ventured to say a single word in defence of the abuses we have endeavoured to expose. They have, on the contrary, been universally condemned ; and if they are to be supported, it must be in despite of the opinion of the whole people of England.

While, however, we rejoice at this unanimity, we regret that the well-merited condemnation of the existing malt and beer duties, and of the licensing system, should have been coupled with a cry for an increase of the duties on spirits ; and that some of the conductors of the Newspaper Press, most distinguished for talent, have joined in, or countenanced it. In our estimation, the reduction of the duties on gin and whisky in 1823, was a highly wise and beneficial measure ; and nothing could to us appear more injudicious, than any attempt to nullify it, by again increasing the duties. It is to no purpose to contend, in justification of such an increase, that the consumption of spirits is increasing : we admit, and lament the fact ; but we deny that there is more than the shadow of an argument, to prove that this increase is owing to the reduction of the duties. Unless the poor are to be deprived of every enjoyment, and made to subsist, like felons, on bread and water, what can we expect, under the existing laws, but that gin-drinking should increase ? It is an error to ascribe this to the depraved taste of the people. It is the Legislature that is really to blame. The dearth and bad quality of beer, occasioned by the oppressiveness of the duties and the abuses of the licensing system, are the real causes of the multiplication of gin-shops. Until these causes have been removed, gin-drinking will prevail, whatever efforts may be made for its suppression. It will be in vain to attempt to arrest its progress otherwise than by allowing a less intoxicating and more salubrious beverage to come freely into the market, along

with gin, at a reasonable price. The people may be deprived of good and moderately-priced beer, but it is not *possible* to deprive them of spirits. And if we are weak enough to attempt to proscribe the drinking of gin, by doubling or trebling the duties on it, we shall certainly fail of our object;—we shall not lessen, but, on the contrary, increase the consumption;—we shall, however, change the sources of supply, and make that be furnished illegally and clandestinely, which is now furnished legally and openly. An increase of the duties on gin will make what is already bad a great deal worse; it will superadd the atrocities of the smuggler to the idleness and dissipation of the drunkard. These are not speculative opinions, but are bottomed on the widest experience. Efforts have frequently been made to lessen the consumption of ardent spirits by increasing the duties; but they have uniformly proved abortive; and have, without any exception, caused an increase of the very evil they were intended to abate.

During the latter part of the reign of George I., and the earlier part of that of George II., gin-drinking was exceedingly prevalent; and the cheapness of ardent spirits, and the multiplication of public-houses, were denounced from the pulpit, and in the presentments of Grand Juries, as pregnant with the most destructive consequences to the health and morals of the community. At length, Ministers determined to make a vigorous effort to put a stop to the further use of spiritous liquors, except as a cordial or medicine. For this purpose, an act was passed in 1736, the history and effects of which deserve to be studied by those who are now so clamorous for an increase of the duties on gin. Its preamble is to this effect:—‘Whereas the drinking  
‘of spiritous liquors or strong waters, is become very common,  
‘especially among people of lower and inferior rank, the constant and excessive use of which tends greatly to the destruction  
‘of their health, rendering them unfit for useful labour and business, debauching their morals, and inciting them to perpetrate  
‘all vices; and the ill consequences of the excessive use of such  
‘liquors are not confined to the present generation, but extend  
‘to future ages, and tend to the destruction and ruin of this kingdom.’ The enactments were such as might be expected to follow such a preamble. They were not intended to repress the vice of gin drinking, but to root it out altogether. To accomplish this, a duty of *twenty shillings* a-gallon was laid on spirits, exclusive of a heavy license duty on retailers. Extraordinary encouragements were at the same time held out to informers, and a fine of L.100 was ordered to be rigorously exacted from those who, were it even through inadvertency, should vend the



smallest quantity of spirits which had not paid the full duty. Here was an act which might, one should think, have satisfied the bitterest enemy of gin. But instead of the anticipated effects, it produced those directly opposite. The respectable dealers withdrew from a trade proscribed by the legislature; so that the spirit business fell almost entirely into the hands of the lowest and most profligate characters, who, as they had nothing to lose, were not deterred by penalties from breaking through all its provisions. The populace having in this, as in all similar cases, espoused the cause of the smugglers and unlicensed dealers, the officers of the revenue were openly assaulted in the streets of London and other great towns; informers were hunted down like wild beasts; and drunkenness, disorders, and crimes, increased with a frightful rapidity. ‘Within two years of the passing of the act,’ says Tindal, ‘it had become *odious and contemptible*, and policy as well as humanity forced the Commissioners of Excise to mitigate its penalties.’\* The same historian mentions (viii. p. 390), that during the two years in question, no fewer than 12,000 persons were convicted of offences connected with the sale of spirits. But no exertion on the part of the revenue officers and magistrates could stem the torrent of smuggling. According to a statement made by the Earl of Cholmondeley in the House of Lords,† it appears, that at the very moment when the sale of spirits was declared to be illegal, and every possible exertion made to suppress it, upwards of SEVEN MILLIONS of gallons were annually consumed in London, and other parts immediately adjacent! Under such circumstances, Government had but one course to follow—to give up the unequal struggle. In 1742, the high prohibitory duties were accordingly repealed, and such moderate duties imposed, as were calculated to increase the revenue, by increasing the consumption of legally distilled spirits. The bill for this purpose was vehemently opposed in the House of Lords by most of the Bishops, and many other Peers, who exhausted all their rhetoric in depicting the mischievous consequences that would result from a toleration of the practice of gin drinking. To these declamations it was unanswerably replied, that whatever the evils of the practice might be, it was impossible to repress them by prohibitory enactments; and that the attempts to do so had been productive of far more mischief than had ever resulted, or could be expected to result, from the greatest abuse of spirits.

---

\* Continuation of Rapin, vol. viii. p. 358. Ed. 1759.

† Timberland's Debates in the House of Lords, vol. viii. p. 388.

The consequences of the change were highly beneficial. An instant stop was put to smuggling; and if the vice of drunkenness was not materially diminished, it has never been stated that it was increased.

But it is unnecessary to go back to the reign of George II. for proofs of the impotency of high duties to take away the taste for such an article, or to lessen its consumption. The occurrences that have taken place in the present reign, though they would seem to be already forgotten, are equally decisive as to this question.

Perhaps no country has suffered more from the excessive height to which duties on spirits have been carried than Ireland. If heavy taxes, enforced by severe fiscal regulations, could have made a people sober and industrious, the Irish would have been the most so of any on the face of the earth. In order to make the possessors of property join heartily in suppressing illicit distillation, the novel expedient was here resorted to, of imposing a heavy fine on every parish, town-land, manor-land, or lordship, in which an unlicensed still was found; while the unfortunate wretches found working it were subjected to *transportation for seven years*. But instead of putting down illicit distillation, these unheard-of severities rendered it universal, and filled the country with bloodshed, and even rebellion. It is stated by the Rev. Mr Chichester, in his valuable pamphlet on the Irish Distillery Laws, published in 1818, that ‘the Irish system seemed to have been formed in order to perpetuate smuggling and anarchy. It has culled both the evils of savage and civilized life, and rejected all the advantages which they contain. The calamities of civilized warfare are, in general, inferior to those produced by the Irish distillery laws; and I doubt whether any nation of modern Europe, which is not in a state of actual revolution, can furnish instances of legal cruelty commensurate to those which I have represented.’—Pp. 92, 107.

These statements are borne out to the fullest extent by the official details in the Reports of the Revenue Commissioners. In 1811, say the Commissioners, (*Fifth Report*, p. 19,) when the duty on spirits was 2s. 6d. a-gallon, duty was paid in Ireland on 6,500,361 gallons (Irish measure); whereas, in 1822, when the duty was 5s. 6d., only 2,950,647 gallons were brought to the charge. The Commissioners estimate, that the annual consumption of spirits in Ireland was at this very period not less than TEN MILLIONS of gallons; and, as scarcely *three* millions paid duty, it followed, that *seven* millions were illegally supplied; and ‘taking *one* million of gallons as the quantity fraudulently furnished for consumption by the licensed distillers, the produce

‘ of the unlicensed stills may be estimated at *six millions of gallons.*’—(*Ib.* p. 8.) Now, it is material to keep in mind, that this vast amount of smuggling was carried on in the teeth of the above barbarous statutes, and in despite of the utmost exertions of the police and military to prevent it;—the only result being the exasperation of the populace, and the perpetuation of revolting atrocities, both by them and the military. ‘ In Ireland,’ say the Commissioners, ‘ it will appear, from the evidence annexed to this Report, that parts of the country have been absolutely disorganized, and placed in opposition not only to the civil authority, but to the military force of the Government. The profits to be obtained from the evasion of the law, have been such as to encourage numerous individuals to persevere in these desperate pursuits, notwithstanding the risk of property and life with which they have been attended.’

To put an end to such evils, the Commissioners recommended that the duty on spirits should be reduced from 5s. 6d. to 2s. the wine gallon, (2s. 10d. the imperial gallon;) and Government wisely consented to act upon this recommendation. In 1823, the duties were accordingly reduced; and the following official account will show what has been the result of this measure :—

*An Account of the quantities of Spirits made in Ireland, which have paid the Duties of Excise for Home Consumption; stating the rate of Duty paid; and also the Nett Amount of Revenue received in each year, since the year 1820.—(Par. Paper, No. 340, Sess. 1829.)*

Years.	Number of Gals.	Rate per Gallon.	Net Amount of Revenue.		
			£	d.	s.
1821.	Imp. Measure. 2,649,170	5s. 6d. per Irish Gall.	912,288	7	5
1822.	2,328,387	Ditto.	797,518	13	3
1823.	3,348,505	{ Ditto; from 10th Oct. 1823, 2s. per English Wine Gall. }	634,460	7	2
1824.	6,690,315	Ditto.	771,690	16	0
1825.	9,262,744	Ditto.	1,081,191	6	5
1826.	6,837,408	2s. 10d. per Imperial Gall.	964,509	10	8
1827.	8,260,919	Ditto.	1,122,096	14	10
1828.	9,937,903	Ditto.	1,395,721	12	11

It may appear, on a superficial view of this table, as if the consumption of spirits in Ireland had been trebled since 1823; but, in point of fact, it has not been in any degree increased. The reduction of the duties has substituted legal for illicit distilla-

tion, and freed the country from the perjuries and other atrocities, that grew out of the previous system; but it would be wholly erroneous to say that it has increased drunkenness. We have already seen that the Commissioners, who had the best means of obtaining accurate information, estimated the consumption of spirits in Ireland, in 1823, at TEN millions of gallons, and it is not more at this moment. Yet, in despite of these facts, a clamour is set up for an increase of the duties on spirits! We have too much confidence in the good sense and discernment of Ministers, to suppose that they will be influenced by so senseless a cry. The malt and beer duties are oppressively high; but the spirit duties are not too low, and any effort to increase them would only engender a body of smugglers, not of beer drinkers.

The experience of Scotland is hardly less decisive as to this question. The exorbitancy of the duties produced nearly the same effects here as in Ireland. Mr John Hay Forbes, formerly Sheriff-depute of Perthshire, now one of the Lords of Session, stated in evidence before the Commissioners, that, according to the best information he could obtain, the quantity of illegally distilled spirits annually produced in the Highlands could not amount to less than two *millions of gallons*. In corroboration of this he stated, that in 1821 only 298,138 gallons were brought to the charge in the Highlands, and of these, 254,000 gallons were permitted to the Lowlands, leaving only 44,000 gallons for the consumption of the whole country;—a supply which, we are well assured, would hardly be sufficient for the demand of two moderately populous parishes. In a letter of Captain Munro of Teaninich to the Commissioners, it is stated, that ‘at Tain, ‘where there are upwards of twenty licensed public-houses, *not one gallon had been permitted from the legal distilleries for upwards of twelve months,*’ though a small quantity of smuggled whisky had been purchased at the Excise sales, to give a colour of legality to the trade. The same gentleman thus expresses himself in another part of his letter: ‘The moral effects of this baneful trade of smuggling on the lower classes is most conspicuous, ‘and increasing in an alarming degree, as evidenced by the multiplicity of crimes, and by a degree of insubordination formerly ‘little known in this part of the country. In several districts, ‘such as Strathconon, Strathcarron, &c., the Excise-officers are ‘now often deforced, and dare not attempt to do their duty; ‘and smuggled whisky is often carried to market by smugglers ‘escorted by *armed men*, in defiance of the laws. In short, the ‘Irish system is making rapid progress in the Highlands of ‘Scotland.’

To arrest the progress of demoralization, Government, pursuant to the judicious advice of the Commissioners, reduced the duties on Scotch to the same level as those on Irish whisky; and the consequences have been equally salutary: Smuggling is now almost unknown; the revenue has been greatly increased; and though drinking is, perhaps, somewhat more prevalent in Edinburgh and some of the other large towns, it has declined very much throughout the Highlands. We believe, indeed, we are warranted in affirming, that the total consumption of spirits in Scotland at this moment is decidedly less than in 1823. The subjoined official statement shows the effect of the measure on the consumption of legally-distilled spirits, and on the revenue:—

*An Account of the quantities of Spirits made in Scotland, which have paid the Duties of Excise for Home Consumption; stating the rate of duty paid; and also the Nett Amount of Revenue received in each year, since the year 1820.—(Par. Paper, No. 340, Sess. 1829)*

Years.	Number of Gals.	Rate per Gallon.	Nett Amount of Revenue.		
	Imp. Measure.		£	s.	d.
1821.	2,229,435	5s. 6d. per Eng. Wine Gall.	727,650	19	7
1822.	2,079,556	Ditto	691,136	6	6
1823.	2,232,728	{ Ditto; from 10th Oct. 1823, 2s. per English Wine Gall. }	536,654	17	8
1824.	4,350,301	Ditto.	520,624	18	4
1825.	5,981,550	Ditto;	682,848	11	1
1826.	3,988,788	2s. 10d. per Imperial Gall.	563,263	4	0
1827.	4,752,199	Ditto.	672,441	6	6
1828.	5,716,180	Ditto.	809,559	6	7

Previously to the reduction of the duty on Irish and Scotch spirits, the duty on English spirits had been as high as 10s. 6d. a-gallon. This high duty, and the restrictions under which the trade was placed, were productive of the worst effects. They went far to enable the distillers to fix the price of spirits, 'and 'consequently,' (we quote the words of the Commissioners,) 'to 'raise it much beyond that which was sufficient to repay, with a 'profit, the cost of the manufacture, and the duty advanced to 'the crown.\* And, in proof of this, the Commissioners mention, that in November 1822, 'when corn spirits might be

---

\* Supplement to the Fifth Report of the Commissioners, p. 8.

‘purchased in Scotland for about 2s. 3d. a-gallon, raw spirits ‘could not be purchased in England for less than 4s. 6d. ‘ready money, and 4s. 9d. credit, omitting, in both cases, the ‘duty.’ In consequence of this state of things, the adulteration of spirits was carried on to a great extent in England; and the large profits made by the smuggler occasioned clandestine importation in considerable quantities from Scotland and Ireland. To obviate these inconveniences, and, at the same time, to neutralize the powerful additional stimulus that the reduction of the duties in Scotland and Ireland would have given to smuggling, had the duties in England been continued at their former amount, the latter were reduced, in 1825, to 7s. a-gallon, facilities being, at the same time, given to the importation of spirits from the other parts of the empire. It is of the effects of this measure that so many complaints are made, though nothing can well be imagined more completely destitute of foundation. The Commissioners estimate the consumption of British spirits in England and Wales in 1823, at 5,000,000 gallons, (*Sup. to Fifth Report, p. 8.*) and it appears from Parliamentary Papers that it amounted, for the year ending 5th January 1828, to 6,671,562 gallons: so that, making allowance for the check given to adulteration and smuggling, the increase must appear very trifling indeed; and we are warranted in affirming, that the reduction of the duties has been as eminently successful in England as in either Scotland or Ireland.

But even this increase, such as it is, would not, we are well convinced, have taken place, but for the oppressiveness of the malt and beer duties, and the consequences of the licensing system. The people do not prefer gin—they are driven to it; and it is not by attempting, in despite of common sense and previous experience, to increase the duties on it, but by lowering those on malt and beer, and utterly abolishing the licensing system, that the progress of gin-drinking can be arrested.

Were the duties on spirits increased in England, they must also be increased in Ireland and Scotland; for, otherwise, it would be impossible to prevent the clandestine introduction of immense quantities into England. But no increase of the duties in this part of the empire, or in Ireland, could take place without reviving the dormant energies of the smuggler, and renewing the atrocities we have already described.

Whatever measures Ministers may adopt in relation to the malt and beer duties, we therefore hope, that they will reject every proposal for an increase of the spirit duties. However pernicious the practice of dram-drinking may be, no one whose opinions are entitled to the least regard, will maintain that the oc-

casional, or even perpetual, intoxication of a small portion of the dregs of the population, is an evil to be compared with the general diffusion of those lawless habits which always attend the prevalence of smuggling. It is not in the power of Government, do what it may, to lessen the practice of gin-drinking, otherwise than by allowing good beer to be freely retailed at a moderate price. The taste for spirits is not to be eradicated by violent and compulsory measures. And the only question at issue, if a question can be raised on such a subject, is, Whether it is best that the existing demand for spirits should be supplied by the fair trader or the smuggler? We hope, and believe, that Government will decide this question conformably to the plain dictates of sound policy and good sense; and since the people will have an exhilarating beverage of some sort or other, that the duties and restraints on the manufacture and sale of beer, will be so reduced and modified as to enable it to come fairly into competition with spirits.

---

ART. IX.—*A Dissertation on the Course and probable Termination of the Niger.* By LIEUT.-GEN. SIR RUFANE DONKIN, G.C.H. K.C.B. and F.R.S. 8vo. London. 1829.

**T**HIS is a lively, learned, and original discussion of the question in modern geography, which has excited an interest beyond any other. Sir Rufane, we think, possesses many of the qualities which go to form a good critical geographer. He has learning, ingenuity, and candour; and the due and cautious application of these qualities may aid him hereafter to solve difficult problems, and to bring ancient and modern geography into harmony. Although, therefore, we consider him as having failed in the precise object of the present volume, and on the whole, as not having thoroughly sounded the depths of African geography, yet we have followed him with pleasure through some of the curious veins of research which he has opened; and we should gladly meet him again, endeavouring to trace, with somewhat more of patient induction, certain of the thorny tracks in which the geographical enquirer is still entangled.

Sir Rufane begins with some etymological remarks on the origin of the names which have been assigned to the greatest rivers. He has collected numerous facts, which go far to prove, that these, in many instances, are derived from the blue or black

colour, which their waters exhibit. Nile, or Neil, in all the oriental languages, signifies blue,—consequently, the Nile is the blue river. The Indus is very usually called the Nile; and our author has heard a native of Hindostan apply the same appellation to the Ganges. The Bahr-el-Azrek also signifies blue river. Black is likewise an appellation specially applied to rivers of the first magnitude. The Hindoos call the ocean Kala, or Kolla Panee,—the Black Water. ΜΕΛΑΣ is the name often given by the Greeks to the Nile, as well as to a large river in Thessaly; and *Shihor*, in Hebrew, bears the same import. Sir Rufane informs us, that he has in vain enquired among oriental scholars, for any signification which can be attached to the word *Quolla*. We wonder at this, seeing he has himself cited *Kolla* as the Hindoo term signifying black; and K and Q are altogether convertible, and are converted in this very name. Our author rejects also the support which his theory might have derived from the name *Niger*; contending that the ΝΥΓΕΙΡ of Ptolemy is the original of the term, and has no known signification. The name certainly does not occur in Herodotus, Strabo, or probably any Greek writer prior to Ptolemy; nor is it, we believe, recognised in central, or indeed any part of modern Africa. But *Niger* does occur in Pliny and other Roman writers, who wrote before Ptolemy; and we strongly surmise, with Major Rennell, that this is its real original, and that Nigeir is a mere *hellenizing* of Niger.

We have followed our author through these etymologies, as they appear curious and correct to a great extent; but we do not find that he has brought them to bear very conclusively on the illustration of African geography. His inference is, that the terms Nile, Quolla, Niger, are often applied, not to any particular river, but to any *great river*, and should be translated not *the*, but *a Nile*, *a Niger*,—a deep blue, or dark river. His chief application of the doctrine, is to neutralize Herodotus's inference of the western derivation of the Nile, founded on the report of the Nasamonian youths, who being carried to a great city of interior Africa, found there a large river, flowing in this direction. Παρα δε την Πολιν ρεειν ποταμον μεγαν,—ρεειν δε απο Εσπερης αυτον προς κλιον ανατελλοντα; και Ετεαρχος συνεβαλλέο ειναι τον Νειλον. ‘By the city flowed a great river from west to east;’ and Etearchus (who gave the information) supposed that this ‘was the Nile.’ Our author having by diligent search through the manuscript copies of Herodotus, found two of high authority, in which the τον is wanting, contends that Etearchus here infers the existence not of *the*, but of *a Nile*;—merely of a large blue,



or black river. The context, however, appears in the most decided manner, to fix an opposite sense. Herodotus was enquiring as to the source, not of a Nile, but of the Egyptian Nile, by tracing it from its mouth to Meroe, and then to the Isle of the Exiles; where, finding positive information cease, he has recourse to the story of the Nasamonians, and the opinion of Etearchus, as the only means by which any light could be thrown on its origin and early course. To have said, then, 'that the Nasamonians had discovered a great river, and Etearchus supposed that this was a great river,' would neither have had any meaning in itself, nor any bearing on the subject under discussion. The passage can be made connected and significant, only by the usual understanding, that the Nasamonians having discovered a great river, Etearchus supposed that this river was *the Nile*. Sir Rufane, we are aware, objects to the word *supposed*; but allowing his own interpretation of *συμβалλομαι*, and making it, 'Etearchus *added*,' we do not see that this reading could occasion any difference.

We may here notice that, so far as our very slight materials go, we incline to concur with our author, in believing the river reached by the Nasamonian adventurers to be one in central Africa, and most probably the Yeou. True, at a certain point, the adventurers are said to have turned westward; but admitting *σπρος Ζεφυρον* to signify simply west, the term must seemingly be understood as modified by the general direction of the journey, which, being undertaken with a view to penetrate inward from the northern coast, was essentially south: Thus, in travelling from London to Carlisle by way of York, one might say, after passing the latter city, that he turned west, though the general direction was still north. No other part of the interior seems to furnish this great river,—at least till we reach the tract behind the Mauritanian Atlas, and this would be as distant as Bornou; and being even somewhat to the north of the Cyrenaic territory, would imply an entire change of the original direction.

Our author next endeavours to pave the way for his theory by an analysis of the geographical system of Ptolemy; and this being the part of the discussion on which he lays his main stress, and being really, in itself, very curious, claims some attention. He makes, however, a singular stumble at the threshold, when he roundly charges Ptolemy with an error of *ten degrees* in the latitude of his own Observatory at Alexandria. Could Ptolemy have committed an error of this magnitude, on a point of such easy investigation, his fame as a geographer and astronomer must have fallen at once to the ground. We know

not how Sir Rufane, whose object is elsewhere to claim almost implicit faith for the graduation of Ptolemy, should have fallen into so great an error against himself, on so simple a point. Ptolemy's latitude of Alexandria is 31 degrees;—the best modern authorities vary from 31 deg. 11 min. to 31 deg. 16 min.

Having alluded to this mistake, we shall proceed to consider the corrections which Sir Rufane proposes on the Ptolemaic geography. His first consists in no less than an alteration of the first meridian, drawn by Ptolemy through the most easterly of what he calls the *Fortunate isles*. These have in modern times been universally viewed as the Canaries; the most westerly of which, Ferro, was long adopted from Ptolemy by the European nations as their first meridian. Sir Rufane, however, has the merit of first remarking that, while the Canaries differ from the latitude assigned by Ptolemy to his Fortunate islands by fifteen degrees—an error certainly enormous—the Cape de Verd islands are almost precisely in that latitude. Important, however, as this observation is, there are still difficulties attending the transference. First, we may ask, where then would be the Canaries, which must have been passed on the way to this remoter group? This objection would appear almost insurmountable, did we not see in Ptolemy two islands,—Autolan and Cerne, (not seemingly the Cerne of Hanno,) which are nearly in the proper position of the Canaries, and may be part of that group. Another difficulty is, that the Cape de Verd islands cannot be designated as happy, fortunate, or beautiful. Sir Rufane candidly declares, 'there is not a viler spot on the face of the earth.' Even this objection is not perhaps so fatal, as might at first be supposed. Various illusions act on the human mind in regard to such remote and dimly observed extremities of the earth. The idea formed of them, is likely to be, to a great extent, slight, fanciful, and poetical.

But though, for these reasons, we are not prepared to reject this new adjustment of Ptolemy's first meridian, Sir Rufane will probably find on examination, that it can by no means effect that complete reform, which he imagines, in the longitudes of that geographer. To prove this, let us take a general view of the imperfect principles on which Ptolemy founded his graduation. That pompous display of latitudes and longitudes, under which he comprehends all the leading positions on the globe, rested on a very slender basis of observation. Latitude, indeed, can be ascertained by very simple operations performed on the spot; hence, in the civilized countries round the Mediterranean, and up the Nile as far as Syene, all the leading positions,—Alexandria, Rhodes, Rome, Marseilles, &c. are brought

very near to the truth. Beyond this sphere, observation does not appear to have extended; and the latitudes, in receding from it, either to the north or south, become always more and more inaccurate. Longitude, again, can be ascertained only by contemporaneous observations made at distant points, with delicate instruments, and by accurate observers. These were operations which lay beyond the resources of astronomy at that early period. There is nothing to show that Ptolemy had a single observation of longitude on which to found his delineation of the earth.

In absence of any celestial observations, all the longitudes of Ptolemy, and all his latitudes north and south of the Mediterranean, must have been calculated out of itinerary measures. This mode, which can never arrive at any rigid precision, was, at that early period, subject to the greatest imperfection. The itineraries were reckoned from the sailing of ships, the march of armies, the journeying of mercantile caravans; and generally, the calculation was made according to the time employed, without due consideration of the windings of the road, the variations in the rate of travelling, accidental delays, or exaggerations used by those who traversed distant and unknown regions. These circumstances all tended to the overrating of distances; and we know that they were overrated in every system of ancient geography. This source of error was in Ptolemy greatly aggravated by the Geodesic system which he adopted. Eratosthenes had made the degree consist of 700 stadia, which being beyond the real length, counteracted in some measure the excess of his itineraries; but Ptolemy, having adopted the measurement of Posidonius, making the degree 500 stadia, (less than 50 G. miles,) and converting his amplified itineraries into these small degrees, increased his longitudes in an extraordinary manner. It might indeed be supposed that all these longitudes would be modified, and the amount of error reduced, by the movement of his first meridian farther to the west. But, in fact, the influence of that meridian was neutralized by another error, contrary to his general one, in which Ptolemy was early involved. If Sir Rufane will examine the longitudes of Mauritania Tingitania, (varying from 6 to 7 deg.,)—of Gadeira or Cadiz (5 deg. 10 min.)—of Calpe, and Abyla, the Pillars of Hercules (7 deg. 30 min.)—he will find them all decidedly too low, even for the rejected meridian of the Canaries. The source of this error at once appears, when we look at the structure of Ptolemy's Africa, the western coast of which, instead of south-west, is made to run south-east; so that while the most northerly points are placed in long. 6 deg. E. the most southerly are in long. 13 deg. or 14 deg. E. It

might not be difficult to point out the causes which led to so remarkable a *mis-orienting* of this coast; but for our present purpose, the fact is enough. The above longitudes, and especially those of the Straits, being undoubtedly the practical base from which Ptolemy calculated those of his great line reaching across the earth,—it follows, that his first meridian, from this early period, ceased to exercise any influence on their general tenor. This singular countervailing error, committed at the very entrance of the Mediterranean, causes a number of the longitudes on that sea to make some approach to the truth; but the train of Ptolemy's errors becomes manifest, when we compare the Straits with Alexandria, and find the difference made fifty-five degrees when it should be only thirty-six;—an error of nineteen degrees, which makes the Mediterranean longer by one half than it really is. Yet this error remained in the modern maps till it was disclosed by the observations of the French Academicians towards the end of the seventeenth century.

Proceeding still eastward, we find Ptolemy's excess of longitude from the Straits to the mouth of the Indus, to be *thirty-one* degrees; to the mouth of the Ganges, *forty-one*; to the capital of China, (Sera Metropolis,) supposing it Pekin, *fifty-three* degrees. Thus we see Ptolemy's errors accumulate always in proportion to the length of the line upon which the calculation is made; so that scarcely any of them, as they stand, are of any value; though M. Gosselin has no doubt shown that, by the application of a certain regular ratio of reduction, they may be made to come surprisingly near the truth.

The series of longitudes now noticed are those drawn along Ptolemy's great central line, and through the countries with which he was best acquainted. His calculations could not fail to be much more inaccurate, when applied to the vast interior deserts of Africa. We have no idea that he could even have any itineraries, reaching across from the Atlantic, on which to found them. They are evidently fixed, or rather conjectured, from their supposed relation to points on the Mediterranean. Thus, on the whole, it appears, that though Ptolemy's latitudes and longitudes may exhibit the relative position of places and countries adjacent to each other, yet, taken simply as they stand, they have scarcely a chance of coming near the truth, and cannot with safety be adduced in support of any system or theory.

We may deal in the same manner with Ptolemy's descriptive detail of positions in Interior Africa, notwithstanding our author's ingenious efforts to force them into the support of his favourite theory. It may spare us a more particular examination

when we observe, that he cannot find in Ptolemy, the Tchad, the grandest natural feature of Interior Africa; and, that the Nigritian Lake, Ptolemy's grandest feature, cannot, in his scheme, be any longer discovered. It is admitted as possible to give a *translation*, but not a *meaning*, to Ptolemy's description of his principal river courses. It is found necessary to suppose lakes dried up, or carried by a *land-slip* to the distance of two or three hundred miles;—rivers, once subterraneous, now risen to the surface;—others, that formerly overflowed the plains, now rolling below ground. These mighty changes, which are so familiar to geographical theorists, are exceedingly rare in nature; and it surely cannot be maintained, when Ptolemy's *data* must be remodelled by such processes, that their coincidence with modern features can be very striking.

The Garamantic *φαρανέ*, identified with the copper-mines of Fertit, is made, by Sir Rufane, the key of his Central African system. He has justly exposed the absurd mistranslations of the moderns;—one making it a valley, another a mountain, and a third, to lose nothing—*Garamantica vallis mons*; while he proves it to signify a chasm, a place with rents or fissures. But neither this description, nor, for reasons already stated, the approximation in point of longitude, can go far in identifying it with the mines of Fertit, placed in our maps only from the loose itineraries obtained by Browne in Darfur. We fear, if Sir Rufane weighs well the term *Garamantic*, it will carry him to a very remote quarter of the continent; and will surprisingly restrict both the extent and precision of Ptolemy's knowledge of Central Africa. The Garamantes are a people minutely described by the ancient writers—Herodotus, Strabo, Diodorus, Pliny; all of whom fix them in the territory of Fezzan, and especially in that part of it of which Garama, the modern Germa, is the capital. Yet the Garamantes of Ptolemy, from their relation to Augila, and other particulars, appear evidently to be the same people; and the term *Pharanx*, does not ill correspond to the deep rocky valley in which the map of Captain Lyon represents Germa as situated. Hence the suggestion inevitably presents itself, —whether the whole Central Africa of Ptolemy was not confined to the country north of the great desert. This suspicion is much strengthened, when we find Mauritania and Cyrenaica made its northern boundary; the Bagrada, or river of Tunis, derived from Mount Usurgala, which gives rise also to the Gir; and the Cynips or river of Cyrenaica, made to rise from a deep interior position. After this, it seems impossible to reject altogether the limitation of Ptolemy's precise knowledge to the territory north of the great desert: yet we are not disposed to admit that he

knew absolutely nothing of the ulterior regions. It seems probable that the Tibboo and the Tuarick, those ancient possessors of the great desert, would then, as now, carry on some intercourse between Northern and Central Africa; that rumours would thus be wafted across that vast expanse, of the mighty rivers and lakes of the interior; and that these reaching Ptolemy by way of Fezzan, were by him blended with that region,—amplifying all its dimensions, and giving it a character not its own. Either Ptolemy had such a knowledge of Central Africa, or he had none at all; in either case, it is impossible to make out from him any thing definitive or connected respecting the geographical features of that obscure region.

Having thus shown, as we think, that Ptolemy's Geography, from its imperfections, was incapable of supporting any system relative to Central Africa, we have thought it unnecessary to view it in relation to Sir Rufane's actual theory; or even, as yet, to state what that theory is. It is now high time to do so, and to consider it in reference to modern information, which alone affords any solid materials for deciding the question. Sir Rufane, then, takes up the Niger, where it was last seen by Clapperton, rolling southward from Boussa. He supposes it there to turn eastward,—to become the Yeou, and pour itself by that channel into the Tchad. Thence, in despite of the negative testimony of Barca Gana, it finds some passage above or below ground, by which it issues forth, and proceeds west and north, till it has united itself with the Misselad, from Lake Fittre. Out of this junction arises the Nile of Bornou, which rolls a broad stream northward, through the sands to the west of Nubia, till it enters the Lakes of Dombou,—supposed to be the *Chelonide* of Ptolemy. Here to human eye it disappears; but as these lakes, it is contended, cannot be the final receptacle of so great a river, Sir Rufane has contrived for it a course beneath the silicious sands of Africa, by which moisture, it is said, is always transmitted, and never absorbed. Thus it pours to the northward its subterraneous stream, till it approaches the Mediterranean; when, coming into contact with the violent tide which agitates the Syrtis, it forms that marshy quicksand, of which such alarming reports are given by ancient and modern navigators. The Nile of Bornou did not always hold this dark and hidden course: at one time, we are assured, 'it had its cities, its sages, its warriors, its works of art, and its inundations, like the Classic Nile.'—'The great Nile of Central Africa rolled forward majestically to the shores of the Mediterranean, through countries swarming with people, and animated by intelligence; and through valleys either bespangled by cities, or enamelled

‘ by the varied productions of a luxuriant soil, fertilized by the waters of a noble stream, whose very existence has been for centuries forgotten.’

Afterwards, in a strain of high animation, Egypt is forewarned of her fate:—

‘ In the same way shall perish the Nile of Egypt and its valley ! its pyramids, its temples, and its cities ! The Delta shall become a plashy quicksand—a second Syrtis ! and the Nile shall cease to exist from the Lower Cataract downwards ; for this is about the measure or height of the giant principle of destruction already treading on the Egyptian valley, and which is advancing from the Libyan Desert, backed by other deserts whose names and numbers we do not even know, but which we have endeavoured to class under the ill-defined denomination of Sahara,—advancing, I repeat, to the annihilation of Egypt and all her glories, with the silence, but with the certainty too, of all-devouring time !

‘ There is something quite appalling in the bare contemplation of this inexorable onward march of wholesale death to kingdoms, to mighty rivers, and to nations ; the more so, when we reflect that the destruction must, from its nature, be not only complete, but *eternal*, on the spot on which it falls !’

But from these sublime and awful contemplations, let us return to Boussa, and examine the actual steps by which Sir Rufane conducts the Niger through so strange and devious a course. First, as has been said, he makes it turn east, and, as the Yeou, flow into Lake Tchad. It might not be difficult to show, that the general tenor of Denham and Clapperton’s accounts derives this comparatively small river from the hilly region southward of Houssa. But any lengthened discussion is superseded by Lander’s route from Kano to Dunrora ; which, bringing him within a day’s journey of the Shary, made a section across the only line by which the Quolla could connect itself with the Yeou. The Shary is, then, the only possible channel by which the waters of the Niger can be poured into the Tchad ; and as Sir Rufane may hold that it will equally serve his purpose, we shall suppose this to be the case, and proceed to consider its farther progress.

That the Tchad is insufficient to contain the mass of waters poured into it, is an opinion generally prevalent, though, to ourselves, the impossibility does not appear very manifest. Denham and Clapperton describe this lake as an immense expanse, navigated by decked vessels, and containing large islands, in which a people, called the Biddoomah, have established a formidable piratical power. Its extraordinary extension during the rains,—covering then vast districts that are afterwards abandoned, may account for the surplus waters poured in during that season, and indicates little the existence of any ample or regular outlet. The weight of testimony certainly preponderates against any river

flowing out of the Tchad ; however, as the testimony is not quite complete, let us concede that there may be such a river, and pursue its further course.

Sir Rufane having, as he thinks, conducted the Niger into and out of the Tchad, carries it eastward, till he effects its junction with the Misselad ; supposed to have flowed into and out of Lake Fittre. Of the Misselad we shall say very little, since all we know of it is from the report of Browne, to whom it was represented as flowing to the south of Darfur. The passage through Lake Fittre, and conversion into the Wad-el-Ghazel, are mere geographical hypotheses. Still more hypothetical is its junction with the Niger, hypothetically brought out of Lake Tchad. The junction, however, being supposed, this Nile of Bornou, represented in our maps for the last thirty years, as flowing northward towards the Mediterranean, becomes the basis on which Sir Rufane rests the main weight of his hypothesis. But the mere presence of a geographical feature on the maps of Africa, till we have ascertained how it found its place, can scarcely be considered as forming even a presumption in favour of its actual existence. We hesitate not to say that, in the place and direction now assigned in our maps, there is no such river. The river of Bornou is and can be no other than the river which flows through Bornou :—that is, the Yeou Bornou, as we formerly observed, (vol. xlv. p. 218-19,) through the indistinct and misconceived notices collected by the first African missionaries, was placed a thousand miles distant from what Denham and Clapperton have now ascertained to be its real position. Bornou being thus removed to this great distance, the river of Bornou moves along with it ; and instead of running northward through the great desert towards the Mediterranean, is found to run eastward through Central Africa to fall into the Tchad. With it must depart every foundation on which Sir Rufane can rest his hypothesis ; for there is now neither proof nor presumption of any great river flowing through this part of Africa, to the north of the tenth or twelfth degrees of latitude ; or which, consequently, is not at least twenty degrees distant from the embouchure which he has provided for it.

With regard to the nature of that embouchure, a few words will suffice. We observed, in treating of Captain Beechey's late expedition to the Syrtis, (vol. xlviii. p. 225) that there is nothing in that gulf strictly meriting the appellation of quicksand, from which it has derived so much celebrity. There is, however, an extensive, deep, and dangerous marsh ; and the one, doubtless, may be just as well calculated for receiving the Niger as the other. But be it marsh or be it quicksand, we hope to be excused from just now plunging



farther into it. The Niger must be brought nearer, and by some legitimate channel, before we can consider the discussion as at all relevant. At present, when all we know is, that in one part of Africa, there is a river, and in another, nearly two thousand miles distant, a vast marsh, the hypothesis that this river must penetrate so immense a space under ground to form the marsh, seems to overleap every bound of reasonable concession or genuine theory. The phenomenon of a stream partially subterraneous is not very uncommon, on a small scale; but, that one of the great rivers which water a continent should have its flood thus disposed of, is, we apprehend, wholly without example; for the instances alleged by Ptolemy and Pliny were manifestly mere hypotheses, by which two or three imperfectly known rivers were, in their system, linked together into one.

Having disposed thus freely of the main question, we have to repeat, that notwithstanding the failure as to it, which we consider complete, the work displays decided marks of scholarship and talent; and, viewed as the production of a very gallant soldier, whose life has been passed amidst active scenes, is certainly entitled to much commendation. It embraces, we may add, various curious collateral discussions, into some of which, had not our limits been exhausted, we might have been tempted to dip. As it is, we shall only recommend to the inquisitive reader, the discussions respecting the direction and character of the mountain-chains of Africa, the probable sources of the Congo, and the comparison between the geographical systems of Ptolemy and D'Anville.

ART. X.—1. *Organon der Heilkunst* von Samuel Hahnemann. 4th Edit. Dresden and Leipsic. 8vo. 1829.

2. *Die chronischen Krankheiten, ihre eigenthümliche Natur und homöopathische Heilung* von Samuel Hahnemann. Dresden and Leipsic. 3 vols. 8vo. 1828.

3. *Reine Arzneimittellehre* von Samuel Hahnemann. Dresden. 6 vols. 8vo. 1822—1827.

‘THE highest, nay, the sole, vocation of the medical practitioner, is to make sick men sound;’ and ‘the *beau idéal* of the healing process is an easy, quick, and lasting restoration of health, or a complete annihilation of disease in the shortest, surest, and safest method.’ So says Dr Samuel Hahnemann in the beginning of the text of his *Organon*; and, certainly, if the

ground-work of his system were as securely laid, and the good results of its appliance as undeniable, as these preliminary axioms, he might demand the belief of the most sceptical enquirer, and proclaim himself the author of a new epocha in the history of science.

To build up an universal system of medicine upon a single proposition; to make it plain to the patient by what means and in what manner his cure may be effected; to change the vague and obscure terms of art into a catalogue of distinct and intelligible symptoms; and, last not least, to convert the odious operation of *taking physic* into the simple and not inelegant diversion of swallowing a few tiny pellets of tinctured sugar—to the utter extinction of all draughts, pills, and boluses, and extreme disgrace and discomfort of apothecaries—these are the dashing innovations on the therapeutic art essayed by Dr Hahnemann: and this is the character of that doctrine of *Homöopathie*, which, for the last twenty years, has caused no little sensation among our Teutonic neighbours, though its very name has as yet scarcely penetrated into our insular regions. In this dyspeptic land, where almost every work, however contemptible, upon the interesting topics of disease, diet, and digestion, obtains its hour of popularity, and where the German language and literature are now generally studied, we have found no notice of a subject, so likely, it should seem, to excite attention, except in a few slight and superficial observations by Dr Granville, entombed amid the heavier masses of his journal. Be the doctrines of Hahnemann, therefore, true as they are pleasing, or false as they are startling by their novelty, it is time that they should be made known to the British public, and submitted to the keen and sagacious criticism of our own medical school. Such is the main object of this article; for we are not by any means to be understood as advocating these doctrines, though we should sometimes, for the sake of a more lively statement of them, use the language of Homöopathists.

True or false, Homöopathie is at least not to be confounded with empiricism. It has some of the outward signs, but it has none of the inward and essential characteristics, of quackery. It is not a mystery, concocted and retained for the sake of money-getting; but is fairly and freely given to the world. It is not a resource and refuge for ignorance; but requires extensive knowledge, as well as great experience, in the physician who would practise according to its rules;—a varied and extensive knowledge of the parts and functions of the human frame; of pathology, too, as well as physiology; of botany, and chemistry, and the practical uses of both. It is not an insidious delusion, cou-

verting the hopes of the valetudinarian into instruments of death; a chalice sparkling on the brim, but fatal in the draught; seducing by the first feelings of transient amendment, in order to destroy by the slow, sure result of repeated applications: on the contrary, it enforces abstinence and self-denial; it tampers not with the fine springs of life; and, by the confession even of its enemies, if, in some cases, it should do no good, in scarcely any case can it do positive harm. We say thus much merely to show, in the outset, that we are not about to discuss a subject, to which the most sober or fastidious mind need refuse a share of its attention.

Yet it must be admitted, that there is a good deal of charlatanry about the style and character of Hahnemann. Perpetually assuming his system and truth to be identical, he sets up claims to infallibility that sound very suspicious to Protestant ears. There is a tone of earnest and solemn vanity, whenever he speaks of himself and his pretensions, which provokes not merely laughter, but disgust. 'He knows for what end he is 'here upon the earth;' Homöopathic is the 'great gift of God 'to man;' and a hundred similar phrases, can be tolerated only from the recollection of the writer's country—of the grave enthusiasm with which a German always supports his favourite paradox, and which has laboured to give 'a local habitation and a 'name' to so many 'airy nothings' in philosophy and criticism. Perhaps it will tell still more against his authority with English readers, that Hahnemann avows his partiality to the use, under certain restrictions, of Mesmerism, or Animal Magnetism,—prescribing rules for its application in small 'doses,'\* and citing cases of its miraculous effect. But the worst of his sins against sense, as well as taste, is the vulgar and unseemly abuse which he is not slow nor sparing to heap upon all votaries of Æsculapius that belong not to the sacred band of Homöopathists. If the phrase *intelligent* physician be used by him, *homöopathic*, in brackets by its side, accounts for the unwonted courtesy; while every other member of the tribe is ignorant, incompetent, or even flagitious—'with eyes, yet seeing not,' and learning nothing from an experience, which is no better than a long gaze into a kaleidoscope, upon a thousand shapes of unknown things, without any law to determine their appearance. It is not in this fashion that an acute and learned man should speak of his own profession—the profession of Harvey and Boerhaave, of Sydenham and Hunter, and to which a late eminent scholar of this country (Dr Parr) assigned the palm of knowledge.

---

\* *Die kleinste, homöopathische Gabe.* Orgaon, p. 303.

The opponents of Hahnemann have reasonably availed themselves of the arms against himself, which this unjustifiable petulance supplies. Dr Heinroth of Leipsic,\* who brings the heaviest metal to bear upon the bulwarks of the new system, derives one of his arguments from this source:—If homöopathie be the *only* method of cure, and if all former physicians were fools or knaves, how comes it that any disorder was ever cured in the ‘olden time?’ The *certainly* of former cures demonstrates the futility of Hahnemann’s pretensions. But, though a proper chastisement of Hahnemann’s presumption, this, it is said, is no demolition of his doctrines. Though these may not reveal the *only* mode of healing, it is enough if they teach that which is ‘wisest, virtuous, discreetest, best.’

The fundamental principle of Homöopathie (ὁμοιον πάθος) is expressed in its name. It is, according to Dr Granville, ‘the art of healing founded on resemblances;’ or, more plainly, it seeks to establish as an universal truth the proposition, that *every disease is curable by such medicines as would produce in a healthy person symptoms similar to those which characterise the given disease.*

Opposed, then, to the ancient dogma of the palliative method, *contraria contrariis*, the ‘observation, reflection, and experience’ of Hahnemann have led him to pronounce the oracular decree, *similia similibus curentur*,—that is, *let one nail drive out another*; or, in the language of the poet,

‘Tut! man, one fire burns out another’s burning,  
One pain is lessen’d by another’s anguish;  
Turn giddy, and be help by backward turning;  
One desperate grief cures with another’s languish:  
Take thou some new infection to thy eye,  
And the rank poison of the old will die!’

Lines, which plainly evince, that Shakspeare, who was so many things without suspecting it, was, among the rest, a Homöopathist!

This straight and simple way to the recovery of health, no one, it appears, until the time of Hahnemann, showed as eligible, or, at least, followed out in practice. Yet, if truth lie only in this track, it is natural to expect, as the author of the *Organon*

---

\* Anti-organon, oder das Irrige der Hahnemannischen Lehre im Organon der Heilkunst dargestellt von Dr J. C. A. Heinroth, öffentlichem Professor der psychischen Heilkunde an der Univ. zu Leipzig. *Leipsic*, 1815.

admits, that, though for thousands of years unrecognised, still the great principle must have left, in every age, visible traces of its occasional developement. And, accordingly, when the attention of Hahnemann himself had once been roused by finding that *Cinchona*, or Peruvian bark, the common remedy for intermittent fever, produced in his own frame a number of aguish symptoms, he had recourse to a wide circle of medical authorities, ancient and modern, in search of similar cases. Forty pages of citation demonstrate that the search was not in vain. We shall quote a few of the most remarkable of the cases adduced by him. The author\* of the fifth book *Ἐπιδημιῶν*, describes an Athenian attacked by the most violent *cholera*, as cured by drinking hellebore; which, according to the observations of Forestus, Ledelius, Reimann, and several others, produces of itself a kind of cholera, and which is, indeed, well known to be fiercely emetic and cathartic. The English sweating-sickness, which appeared for the first time in 1485, and was of so murderous a character that 99 out of 100 affected with it died, could not be allayed until the use of *sudorifics* was resorted to; as we learn from the pages of Sennert. Fritze saw convulsions, and De Haen saw convulsions with delirium, caused by a species of nightshade; and, with small doses of the same species of nightshade, the latter effected the cure of similar convulsions and delirium.† Among the many symptoms excited in a sound frame by belladonna, Grimm, Camerarius, Sauter, Cullen, and other medical writers, have noticed a fruitless endeavour to sleep,—difficult respiration, burning thirst,—together with a horror of liquids when brought near the patient,—inability to swallow, an eager desire to snap or spit at the bystanders; in short, a perfect image of that sort of hydrophobia, which Thomas de Mayerre, Münch, Buchholz, and Neimike, completely cured by the use of this plant. |

---

\* Hahnemann considers this book to be falsely ascribed to Hippocrates. Celsus, however, together with Quintilian and Plutarch, supposes it genuine. Galen believes it to be the production of the younger Hippocrates, nephew to the elder.

† The words of De Haen are remarkable : *Dulco-amara stipites majori dosi convulsiones et deliria excitant, moderata vero spasmos, convulsionæque solvunt. Ratio medendi*, tom. iv. 228. He was not far, as Hahnemann observes, from Homœopathic.

‡ If belladonna often fails in the cure of canine madness, Dr Hahnemann would impute such failures to the improper greatness of the doses given, or to some variation in the symptoms of the particular case, which would demand a different specific. Thorn-apple (*Datura stramonium*), and henbane (*Hyoscyamus niger*), are two other remedies, in the homœopathic pharmacopœia, for this dreadful malady. To these, according to

And so Dr Hahnemann proceeds through a long series of pages. But to the list of cases thus accumulated by his erudition, the antagonists oppose two objections. One party, headed by Dr Jörg, accuses him of false references; of misrepresentations of meaning when the references are correct; and, in short, of all the arts of unfair quotation. We are bound, however, to remark, that where we have taken the pains to verify his citations, we have not found Hahnemann guilty of the fraud thus imputed to his charge. On the other hand, Heinroth, even allowing the cases to be correctly cited, boldly denies the inference which Hahnemann would draw from them. Cures, he says, may have been effected, while specifics seeming to comply with the rule, *similia similibus*, were employed; but is the *reason* of these cures actually explained, as the new doctrine supposes, by the *fact*, or is it not rather a *petitio principii*, to assume that it is so?

From the elevated region of learned quotation, Dr Hahnemann descends to consult the experience of ordinary life. On the frozen limb, he observes, in support of his great principle, we lay some freezing mixture, or rub the part with snow. The sagacious cook, when his or her hand has been scalded by one of those accidents to which the most interesting of all occupations is unhappily exposed, holds it near the fire; wisely despising the increased smart which this occasions, in the conviction that the pain and its cause will be removed by a few minutes of endurance. Others apply heated spirits of wine, or oil of turpentine, which work a cure in a few hours; whereas cooling salves might be used in vain for as many months, and cold water only aggravates the mischief. And here the culinary empiric has the support of mighty names. Fernelius (*Therap. L. vi. c. 20.*) recom-

---

the remark of Drs Hartlaub and Trinks, in the *Arzneimittellehre*, published by them at Leipsic, may be added a fourth, viz, *cantharides*. Both in former and more recent times, the efficacy of this powerful medicine in preventing the fatal consequences of the bite of a mad dog, has been observed; and the inhabitants of Hungary, Poland, Italy, and Greece, are well acquainted with its use. When taken as a prophylactic, Professor Rust has observed, that, in a practice of 18 years, he never knew it fail to prevent the breaking out of madness after a bite; and Dr Axter of Vienna, asserts the same fact from 30 years' experience. Even after decided symptoms of *rabies* have appeared, Rust, Axter, and Hildreth, (*New York Med. Repos. No. 19, p. 311.*) have recovered patients by the aid of cantharides, given in very small doses. The importance of this subject in Germany may be inferred from the fact, that, within the Prussian dominions alone, from the year 1820 to 1826, no less than 694 persons died of hydrophobia.

mends to approximate the burnt part to the fire. John Hunter condemns the use of cold water, and likewise approves of exposure to the fire. Sydenham and Benjamin Bell declare for spirits of wine; and Kentish, Heister, and John Bell, applaud the use of turpentine oil.

‘Yes!’ (our author bursts out at this part of his *Organon*,) ‘there were, from time to time, physicians who surmised the ‘important truth, that medicines healed disease only through ‘their fitness for exciting analogous symptoms. Thus the ‘pseudo-Hippocrates,\* in the book *περὶ τόπων τῶν κατ’ ἀνθρώπον*, has ‘the remarkable words: *διὰ τὰ ὅμοια νοῦσος γίνεται, καὶ διὰ τὰ ὅμοια ‘προσφερόμενα ἐκ νοσεύντων ὑγιαίνονται,—διὰ τὸ ἐμείν ἔμετος παύεται.*’ He proceeds to show that Boulduc (*Mémoires de l’Académie Royale*, 1710) believed the purgative property of rhubarb to be the cause of its efficacy in curing diarrhœa; that Detharding (*Eph. Nat. Cur. Cent. x. obs. 76*) explains the power of senna in appeasing ‘colic pangs,’ upon the principle of its tendency to cause them in healthy subjects; that Betholou (*Medicin. Electr. II. p. 15, and 282,*) affirms electricity to exert a control over the same bodily affections in sickness which it causes in health; and thus Thoury (*Mémoire lu à l’Acad. de Caen*) expressly says, that the pulse, which is quickened by positive electricity, has a diseased activity lessened by the same; that Von Stoerck (*libell. de stram. p. 8*) suggests the possibility of thorn-apples proving a cure for madness, *because, when administered to persons of sane mind, it produces symptoms of insanity*; and that, still more explicitly, Stahl, a Danish military surgeon, has declared

---

\* The spuriousness of this treatise is not universally admitted. Galen scarcely notices it, but, among the moderns, Daniel Clerk, Haller, and Fuller, believe it to be authentic. The quotation given in the text is one in which Hahnemann is accused of misrepresentation, because he does not cite the whole passage; and, in the omitted sentences, the opposite doctrine is asserted. But, in fact, some of the omitted sentences are decidedly homœopathic in their tendency; and were they not so, Hahnemann would still have a right to his quotation. For this shows, —as the whole passage likewise shows,—that the Greek writer allowed homœopathic measures in some instances, *i. e.* had a glimpse of the truth, according to Hahnemann’s views; and this is all that the latter asserts. It is strange, however, that Hahnemann did not cite the words, *οἷον στραγγουρίη τὸ αὐτὸ ποίει οὐκ ἰοῦσαν καὶ ἰοῦσαν τὸ αὐτὸ παύει, καὶ βῆξ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ὥσπερ καὶ στραγγουρίη ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν γίνεται καὶ παύεται*,—since these are much more to his purpose than the words *διὰ τὸ ἐμείν ἔμετος παύεται*, which he has cited, and which refer merely to the cure of sickness by a vomit, *in consequence of relieving the stomach of its load—ἐκκλυθήσεται διὰ ἃ ἐμείν σὺν τῷ ἐμίτῳ.*

his convictions, when he says (*in Hummelii comment. de Arthritide*, &c. 1738. 8. p. 40,) that the old rule of healing by *contraries* is altogether erroneous; but that, on the other hand, distempers may be remedied by means which would generate like symptoms (*Similia similibus*). So near were men to the attainment of the great truth! But all these approximations never reached a firmer consistence than that of a passing thought; and so the intolerable caprices of the ancient school remained, until our times, unchanged into a real, safe, and infallible method of healing.

Secure, as he imagines, of the truth of his principle, supported by facts like these, Hahnemann sees little use in attempting a scientific explanation of the *manner* in which it operates. But he writes for a people who must have a reason, of one sort or another, for what they are required to believe. It is of no consequence whether the reason be true, or only plausible; and many of our readers may probably think, that the latter character belongs to the reasoning of Hahnemann; but, such as it is, we shall endeavour to condense it into a few propositions.

Every sickness (if not belonging to the province of surgery,) is a mere disturbance of the vital powers, cognoscible by evident symptoms; and must, by the adhibition of proper medicines, be converted into a similar, but more energetic artificial sickness, which will displace the former natural affection; and, yielding, in its turn, to the vital power, will leave the bodily functions restored to their original integrity. For the human frame is more susceptible of medicinal power, than it is of natural infection—being subject to the operation of the former at all times, and under nearly all circumstances,—but liable to the latter only when a predisposition exists in the organization. Hence the artificial sickness, as absolute and unconditional, will conquer the natural, as conditional, and of a subordinate energy.

But, further, this artificially-excited sickness must be *similar* to the natural, which it is intended to remove. Look to the process of Nature herself in the case of two natural *dissimilar* diseases, that encounter each other in the human frame, and this will prove that even she cannot work unhomöopathically. For, 1, Either the two dissimilar diseases are of like force, or the elder is the stronger of the two, in which case the new infection will be promptly repelled, but the old remain unweakened. Thus, according to Larrey,\* the Levantine plague does not attack those who are infected with scurvy, or afflicted by leprous spots. Or, 2, The new dissimilar disorder is the

---

\* Mémoires et Observations : Description de l'Egypte, tom. i.  
VOL. L. NO. C.



more powerful. Then will the prior malady be for a time suspended, until the new have expired or be healed, when it will return to the charge, not a whit impaired in vigour by its temporary banishment. So Tulpus \* observed, that two children, subject to epileptic convulsions, were cured for a time, while affected with scurf-pate (*tinea*,) but, with the disappearance of the scurf-pate, back came the epilepsy. Madness, supervening to pulmonary consumption, removes it with all its symptoms, but, let the madness depart, and the consumptive symptoms fatally return. † Or, 3, The new disease concludes an alliance with the old, and both, upon the best mutual understanding, carry on their offensive warfare against the constitution. This complication of natural maladies is fortunately rare. During a period of epidemic sickness, when small-pox and measles were raging together, Russel ‡ saw only one case out of 300, in which these two dissimilar diseases simultaneously attacked the same person. Rainey § observed a like incident twice in his practice, and Maurice || also only twice. Zencker ¶ relates a case of cow-pox, which ran its natural course side by side, with measles and the purples; and Jenner saw the progress of cow-pox undisturbed by a venereal disorder under mercurial treatment. The complication is much more frequent, when the supervening disorder is caused by a mistaken (*allopathic*) course of medicine.

But the result is very different when two *similar* diseases meet; *i. e.* when to a prior disorder, one of like kind, but greater energy, is added. Then man may learn a lesson from nature. For, in this event, the one neither keeps off the other, remaining itself unchanged (as in case 1, of the dissimilar diseases;) nor (as in case 2,) does one relieve the other, only long enough for it to take breath and return; nor (as in case 3,) does a double and complex malady ensue. On the contrary, two such diseases, similar in their symptoms, though different in their origin, annihilate each other. Thus every one knows, that violent inflammation of the eyes, even to blindness, is caused by small-

\* Obs. lib. i. Obs. 8.

† Mania phthisi superveniens eam cum omnibus suis phænomenis aufert, verum mox redit phthisis et occidit, abeunte mania. Reil. Memorab. Fasc. III. v. p. 171.

‡ Transactions of a Soc. for the Improvement of Med. and Chir. Knowl. II.

§ Edinb. Med. Comment. III. p. 480.

|| Med. and Phys. Journ. 1805.

¶ In *Hufeland's Journal*, XVII.

pox, and lo ! by inoculation for the small-pox a chronic inflammation of the eyes was perfectly cured, as is reported by Dezo-teux \* and Leroy.† Deafness and difficulty in breathing have been removed in the same way according to Closs.‡ The fever attendant upon cow-pox cured an intermittent fever in two persons, as observed by Hardege,§ the younger, in confirmation of John Hunter's remark,|| that two fevers (similar diseases) cannot co-exist in the same frame.

In this train of argument, with its accompanying illustrations, it might not be hard to detect flaws ; but Dr Heinroth is rash in asserting, that, if his logic fail, the author of the new doctrines must be altogether wrong. Many a judge has arrived at a sound conclusion, in whose reasons there would be found as little logic as law. Heinroth begins his *anti-organon* by stating, that he will not inquire into the results of homöopathic practice, but only into the truth of the fundamental propositions. Now he should have paid more attention to the facts than the argument ; since the former are the test by which the pretensions of homöopathic must finally be tried.

It is upon the foregoing propositions, true or false, that Hahnemann grounds his division of the healing art into three branches. First stands the *homöopathic*, the 'only proper' method, imitating nature in her most scientific mood : Then the *allopathic* or *heteropathic*, hitherto the commonest method, which hopes to cure disease by exciting some dissimilar affection : Lastly, the *antipathic* or *enantiopathic* (the *palliative*,) which meets a disorder in the teeth, opposes contrary to contrary, gives for a season a seeming relief, but ends by making matters worse. It is a proof of Hahnemann's celebrity, that he has made these learned appellations current over great part of the continent. There, the dispensers of health and longevity are now known as Homöopaths or Allopaths.

Out of the main theorem of Homöopathic proceed two corollaries, which have excited as much discussion as the great principle itself. The first is, that disease is nothing but an aggregate of symptoms ; and that, therefore, in the treatment of disease, the physician's sole business is to extinguish the symptoms,

\* *Traité de l'Inoculation.* p. 189.

† *Heilkunde für Mütter.* p. 384.

‡ *Neue Heilart der Kinderpocken*, Ulm. 1769. p. 68, and specim. Obs. No. 18.

§ In *Hufeland's Journ. der pr. Arneik.* XXIII.

Of the Vener. Disease. p. 4.

since this will necessarily infer the extinction of their cause. It is true, that *cessante causa tollitur effectus*, but the reverse of this adage is held by Hahnemann to be equally true. He and his disciples, though skilled in the facts of pathology, reject the customary names, whether popular or scientific; they profess to know nothing about

All feverous kinds,  
Convulsions, epilepsies, fierce catarrhs,

but only about the component pains and debilities, out of which these, and all other varieties of sickness, are made up. A genuine Homöopath does not ask you whether you have a fever, or a cold, or a fit of gout, or of rheumatism; but he makes curious inquiries as to the state of your skin, your head, your joints, or your principal toe. Nay, he does not understand what you mean by a head-ach, or ear-ach, or stomach-ach, but he must learn in what part of the head, in which of the ears, in what corner of the stomach uneasiness prevails, and whether it be a throbbing pain, or a boring pain, a gnawing, a pricking, a rending, or a griping pain. For, since by symptoms alone his practice is guided, he must have at least full cognisance of these; pursuing them through all the categories of *how, when, where*, and with a degree of inquisitive minuteness, that defies the competition of common mediciners. Two closely printed pages of the organon dictate the heads under which these inquiries ought to be conducted, and still leave an undefined &c. to be filled up by the sagacity of the practitioner.

Although this view of the nature of disease is by no means new—for even in the words of the venerable Gaubius, ‘*morbus est complexus symptomatum*’—and although most physicians, we believe, in practice, while they may talk of treating causes, really address their means of cure to the effects, yet both the definition, and the rules derived from it, have encountered eager opposition. Against the definition metaphysical arguments are arrayed: such as the psychological fact, that synthesis precedes analysis in our perception of things—the child knowing its nurse *in toto* before it makes a special acquaintance with her nose, eyes, mouth, or hands—the self-evident proposition, that cause and effect are not the same, and others of a like nature. Sick people, however, who desire to get well, do not trouble themselves much with metaphysics. If restored to a durable and certain convalescence, by the removal of every disagreeable or dangerous symptom, they care not about critical questions of precedence between supposed causes and effects. The proximate cause of hunger has not yet been ascertained, but we know by happy ex-

perience that a hearty meal puts an end to the distressing part of the affair—the hungry sensations. And, really, if a course of medicine drive away all the bad effects of any given malady, and leave no seeds of future and similar suffering uneradicated, we see not what is wanting to a perfect cure. A partial, or what is usually called a symptomatic cure, is despised by Hahnemann as much as by any of his antagonists; he is satisfied with nothing less than a complete suppression of all symptoms, and a full and lasting re-establishment of health. Again, against the rules for practice, it is urged, that the proposed questions are over-minute; that it is no easy matter to ascertain all the symptoms of a case; and that, even if it were, the disuse of general names would be ill compensated by an infinite accumulation of individual symptoms. But if general names give an image of disease that is useful to the practising physician, so certainly do the answers sought for by the homöopathic interrogatories; it is not mere affectation, but a proper desire to discriminate, that multiplies those questions, and any apparent over-minuteness upon paper is really modified in practice, as Dr Heinroth himself admits.

Since, then, symptoms are the point to be assailed, and since every collection of symptoms must be cured by something which would excite analogous affections in a healthy subject, the mode of making out a homöopathic pharmacopœia may be easily imagined. A set of meek and much-enduring men, of sound constitutions, must be found ready to submit their own bodies to the useful, but unpleasing, task of serving as pharmaceutical tests. Taking a proper quantity of the mineral, vegetable, or animal substance to be tested, and strictly observing a course of diet which will not perplex or counteract the operation of such substances, they must note down, under a series of heads, given in the *Arzneimittellehre* of Hahnemann, the various sensations that ensue. One objection to this process, viz. that the sensations caused by any substance in a *healthy* frame form no rule by which to judge of its effects on a *disordered* one, is clearly nullified by the main principle of Homöopathie, if that be recognised as true. Another objection, brought forward by Dr Heinroth, that many of the medicinal substances most prized by the Homöopaths, being of a poisonous quality, their genuine effects can never be ascertained by any one whom they would not for ever incapacitate for making a boast of his discoveries, is as illogical as the worst parts of the *Organon*; since a man may well take of a poisonous substance, enough to judge of its tendencies, without pursuing his experiment to a fatal extreme. And a third objection, that it must prove nearly impossible to

light upon proper pharmacometers, because very few have sound constitutions, and even the healthy are frequently endowed with strange peculiarities of constitution—(so that, for instance, one man can imbibe, without suffering from it, a quantity of laudanum sufficient to consign five others to the grave)—appears to be a libel upon human nature, and a gross exaggeration of idiosyncrasy. Dr Hahnemann affirms, that he himself, and the rest of his pharmacometers, are in thorough condition, and quite free from troublesome idiosyncrasies; and a most curious book is the *Arzneimittellehre*, or doctrine of medicaments, produced by the experience of this patriotic band, and already extended to eight\* goodly octavos. Dr Kitchiner, of gastronomic memory, commends his book of cookery by the assurance that he has *eaten through* every recipe therein given; but what is this to the exertions of Hahnemann and his disciples! These have really been *pains-taking* discoverers. All their knowledge is the fruit of tortured heads and emperilled intestines; and not a little extraordinary, both in extent and minuteness, are the results of their researches. Under every title of their *materia medica* the list of symptoms is prodigious: *nux vomica* alone yields more than 1200; *calcareo carbonica* (obtained from oyster-shells) gives 1090; and the *succus sepia* no less than 1242. Even admitting that one-half of these symptoms may have been purely imaginary, or the results of something foreign to the substances tested, or of a vicious idiosyncrasy, there still remains a large sum to be carried to the advancement of pharmaceutical science.

The second corollary from the great homöopathic principle is attained through something like the following process of ratiocination. Since, in the treatment of a disease, medicines calculated to produce similar effects are alone to be used, these medicines will have to work upon an organization already predisposed to be affected by them; and the power of medicine being at any rate more energetic than that of natural sickness, a *very small quantity* of medicine must be adequate to act upon an organization thus prepared. The slightest aggravation of the disease by medical means will constitute an artificial malady powerful enough to control and suppress the natural one; and the more slight this artificial malady, the more easily will it in its turn give way to the vital principle. The necessity of small doses is thus plausibly deduced; but the practical shape which this conclusion takes is the most startling part of the whole Hahnemannian system, and that which will assuredly give the rudest

---

\* Two volumes of the *Cronischen Krankheiten* belong to this number.

shock to the reader's credulity. Proceeding step by step in his reductions, Dr Hahnemann has at length brought down his doses to an exiguity unheard-of, and seemingly incredible. The millionth part of a grain of many substances is an ordinary dose; but the reduction proceeds to the billionth, trillionth, nay to the decillionth, portion of a grain! By describing the mode of preparation, we shall give a clearer idea of these marvellous prescriptions. Supposing the medicine to belong to the mineral kingdom, one grain of it, if possible in a pulverised form, is mixed with 99 grains of sugar of milk, by rubbing them together in a glass or stone mortar for the space of an hour. Of this mixture, one grain is, in like manner, taken and compounded by another rubbing of an hour's duration, with 99 grains of sugar of milk, so that each grain of this second composition contains only one ten-thousandth part of the original grain of medicine. A third trituration will bring the proportion down to one millionth, a sixth to one billionth, a ninth to one trillionth part, and so on, if it be expedient to carry the reduction farther. In the preparation of mercury, one grain of pure running quicksilver is reduced in this manner to the millionth degree; a single grain of the powder thus obtained is then dissolved in 99 drops of diluted spirits of wine; one drop of this solution is again shaken together with 99 drops of the vinous spirit, and another repetition of this process having reduced the mixture to the billionth degree, a few sugar pellets, of the size of poppy seeds, are moistened with this liquid, whereof two or three constitute a dose! In expressing medicine from a plant, one drop of the extracted juice is mixed and reduced in the same manner with repeated quantities of the spirits of wine, until the proper degree of attenuation is achieved. For administering all kinds of homöopathic medicine the little sugar pellets are the favourite medium. A more agreeable mode of physicking was certainly never devised; nor one more sure to relieve the specific drug, suitable for a given case, from the admixture of heterogeneous elements.\* But the deglutition of even these minute particles of matter is not esteemed always necessary: in the use of the *loadstone*, it is by touch alone that the medicinal effect is sought to be produced. In more than one instance, Dr Hahnemann prescribes merely to smell the phial in which the pellets are enclosed; nay, by some hints that he drops here and

---

\* Hahnemann affirms that neither sugar of milk, nor spirits of wine, after the process of commixture with the substances employed by him, have, of themselves, any medicinal qualities.

there, he seems to believe that certain drugs may be taken, as adepts read music, *at sight*!

Though we should abstract from this doctrine of infinitesimal doses the last-noticed excess of its extravagance, there would still remain enough, in all conscience, to dilate the eyes of the greediest lovers of the wonderful. It is against this part of his system, accordingly, that Dr Hahnemann's opponents have directed the thickest shafts of their ridicule as well as of their more serious arguments. Thus the facetious Ludwig Wilhelm Sachs,\* a Professor in the University of Königsberg, seeks to demonstrate the nullity of the small doses by comparing them with a flea set to draw the load of four horses; though to this 'base comparison' it might well be answered by a Homöopath, that the flea which should bear an analogy to his thrice-pound-ed and well-shaken preparations could be no common flea, and that, if it were so, the weight removeable by such an agent could be no proper burthen for a team. Another ingenious adversary suggests, that if the decillionth part of a grain have any efficacy, an ounce of medicine thrown into the Lake of Geneva would be sufficient to physic all the Calvinists of Switzerland, But to this it has been thought worth while gravely to reply, 1st, That there is no real analogy between the terms of this fanciful proportion; and, 2dly, That the body of liquid in the Lake of Geneva could not, even by one of its own storms, be shaken into such perfect commixture with the medicinal ingredient as the conditions of a homöopathic prescription require. Further, the self-contradictions of Hahnemann under this head are arrayed by Dr Sachs against him. It seems, that in 1797 Dr Hahnemann talked and wrote of the marvellous effects of *Ignatia amara* in an epidemic fever among children, when he gave from one-half to two-thirds of a grain to infants between one and three years of age, and from two to three grains to children between seven and ten years, repeating his doses every twelve hours: now a trillionth, a quadrillionth, or even a smaller portion of a grain, is deemed by him a sufficient dose; so that the inhabitants of a whole solar system might be cured with what he formerly gave to a suckling. So, in cases of influenza, the Hahnemann of former days was wont to administer from thirty to forty grains of camphor every twenty-four hours, and did not

---

\* Versuch zu einem Schlussworte über S. Hahnemann's homöopathische system, nebst einigen conjecturen von L. W. Sachs, der Mediziner und Chirurgie Doctor, Professor des Medizins an der Universität Königsberg, Ritter des St Wladimirordens. Leipzig, 1820, Oct. pp. 49.

fail of curing once in a hundred instances ; whereas, according to his present practice, a new universe would need to be created for the consumption of such a dose.

The charge of inconsistency is evidently no argument. It is unfair to suppose that, because a man may have once been wrong, he can never be right. But that this strange doctrine of infinitesimal doses should have encountered opposition, is certainly nothing surprising. For ourselves, we at first set it down as a mere vagary of that wild paradoxical spirit which animates the whole mass of German philosophy and literature ; a spirit that commences with the very seeds of German education, and grows and strengthens with every accession to the genius or erudition of the country. Where mere erudition is a perfect drug, and an unwise and unsafe principle of restless competition among academic dignitaries is openly encouraged, it is not strange that singularity should be more prized than truth ; and that literary and scientific men, endeavouring to outstrip all rivalry, should rush to those extremes of speculation which it is absurd, and often dangerous, to approach. We thought, therefore, that Dr Hahnemann had just been guilty of a piece of *renowning* in this part of his theory, and that it would scarcely be worth while to attend to any reasoning by which he might essay to support it.

But let us hear what the great Homöopath has to say for himself, and what may be advanced from other sources in favour of this extraordinary part of the system. How can small doses of so much attenuated substances still possess a mighty healing power ? is the question, says Hahnemann, not only of the common large-dose-dispensing Allopath, but even of the incipient believer in the laws of Homöopathie. Now, in the first place, it is foolish to doubt the *possibility* of that which in reality takes place, and which the daily experience of hundreds will confirm as fact ; ‘ since,’ our author pursues, ‘ that which *actually happens* must at least be *possible*.’ More of this startling assertion hereafter, only let us support it in passing by the authority of Aristotle: τὰ δὲ γυνόμενα φανερόν ὅτι δυνατό· οὐ γὰρ ἐγένετο εἴην ἀδύνατα,\* —an argument which no one should have borrowed without acknowledgment. But, secondly, The sceptics do not consider all the *rubbing* and *shaking* bestowed upon the homöopathic preparations. Not only an alteration, but a wonderful development of power in medicinal substances, Hahnemann affirms to be produced by these means ; and he claims this discovery as one of the greatest ever made. Marvellous, indeed, are the ef-

---

\* Aristot. Poet. IX. 6. ed. Hermann.



fects of friction ! The clown who lights his pipe with flint and steel little thinks of the surprising power which his operation has developed in the colliding materials ; yet a microscope, or even the naked eye, will show him particles of steel melted by the stroke,—so that a heat of 3000 degrees of Fahrenheit has been evolved in the process of collision. And mere rubbing will draw out the latent caloric ; as Count Rumford found that chambers could be heated by the simple motion of metal plates rubbed rapidly together. Horn, bone, ivory, and some other substances, though inodorous when left alone, emit a strong smell when subjected to friction. Other changes in the properties of matter, more directly to his own purpose, are pointed out by our author. Thus various substances, insoluble in their crude state, become, after trituration, capable of solution either in water or in spirits of wine. The dark liquor obtained from the sepia is soluble, in its primitive condition, only in water, not in spirits of wine ; but the homöopathic process makes it soluble in the latter menstruum likewise. Magnesia, marble, and other calcareous substances, after undergoing this process, become perfectly soluble, though they will not thoroughly combine with either water or spirits of wine before it. Hahnemann announces himself as the first observer of these chemical facts ; but still more emphatically as the first who has detected that great increase of power in medicines, through rubbing or shaking, to which we have already alluded. This increase is so vast, that a drop of *drosera*, or *sun-dew*, attenuated to the thirtieth degree, but shaken at each reduction *twenty times*, when given to a child ill of whooping-cough, causes imminent danger ; whereas, if the shaking be repeated only *twice*, a single sugar-pellet moistened with this liquid in the 30th degree of attenuation, works a rapid cure ! Accordingly, it is upon the augmented force of the medicines, however reduced in bulk, which results from his mode of preparing them, that Hahnemann seems inclined to rest his explanation of the efficacy of infinitesimal doses.

But though this may be a very scientific mode of reasoning, we confess a predilection for facts ; and we can neither ourselves give credence to, nor expect our readers to give credence to, this singular part of the homöopathic theory, except in so far as facts can be adduced to support it. We return, therefore, to the first Aristotelian argument of Hahnemann, and demand the only illustration which it is capable of receiving—cases of well-authenticated cures, performed by means of the homöopathic drugs. From the medical journal of the party—the *Archiv für die hom. Heilkunst*—a vast number of extraordinary cases might be cited ; but we prefer, for obvious reasons,

to state a few cases which fell under our own observation, or were reported to us, not merely by professional men, but by persons of the highest station and intelligence in Austria and Saxony, the circle within which Homöopathie is most prevalent.

In the Bohemian town of Senftenberg, that cruel disorder, the bloody flux, was raging with great violence and most fatal effects. The ordinary arts of medicine were tried in vain to arrest its progress. In sheer despair, the homöopathic prescriptions were adopted, and with immediate and uniform success.—A jager, or huntsman, belonging to the Baron of Senftenberg, lay at the point of extreme unction with fever and inflammation of the throat. As a last resort, a few of the homöopathic pellets were administered; the dying man was out of bed next morning, and on the second day, when, according to all established principles, he should have been quietly stretched in his coffin, he was handling his gun in the forests. A decided sceptic witnessed this case, and became from that moment as decided a believer in homöopathie.—A Bohemian gentleman was afflicted with one of the worst forms of lepra, aggravated by the most complicated ailments of the stomach. His physicians declared him incurable; and we know the same disorder to have been pronounced incurable, and to have remained uncured, in England also. In a few months, however, the homöopathic medicines and diet removed every symptom of complaint: the lepra disappeared, and the patient arrived at the real apex of human felicity—the unconsciousness of possessing a stomach.—One of the many sons of a well-known London baronet came abroad *moribundus*. His constitution seemed exhausted by the effects of a brain fever. He had tried many physicians, many waters, and many medicines, to no purpose. He owed his recovery to homöopathie, and expresses the greatest gratitude to our informant, who advised him to make the experiment.—The director of the theatre at Prague had four children sick of the croup. One died; two were cured *secundem artem*, after a long interval of suspense and anxiety; the fourth, when taken ill, was allowed to be treated homöopathically, and recovered in a day.\* The same director had the grace to allow the successful homöopath to prescribe for his wife, and returned thanks, from the stage of the theatre, to Dr

---

\* The hom. prescription for this frightful disorder is, 1. *Aconitum*, to work from six to twelve hours, and, 2. *Spongia*, to work for three or four

Loewe, for restoring her to health.—A merchant of Leipsic had an ancient and inveterate disorder of the stomach; perpetual nausea, habitual constipation, and an inclination to vomit after the least attempt to eat, were among the mildest of his symptoms. After the first homöopathic dose, prescribed by Dr Hartlaub, the disease began to yield; the system was pursued with gradually-increasing success, and now the man of commerce is as fairly on his legs again as ‘any he’ in Saxony. His case, if we ventured to describe it minutely, would be found quite as striking as one reported by Dr Granville, to whom we refer our readers. When the Field-marshal Prince Schwarzenburg, not a person for a medical compatriot to trifle with, applied for advice to Dr Mahrenzeller, then practising at Prague, this physician referred him to one hundred cures, performed in that capital, as the best testimonial to the merits of the system. Mahrenzeller is now at Vienna, and continues to prescribe infinitesimal doses with the happiest results. In cases of rheum, fever, and inflammation of every kind, his success is said to be marvellous. It might be thought trifling to swell the list of our personal observations with cures of headach, sore throat, toothach, carach, bruises, and other minor accidents and ailments, although these are not really trifles; if, as a recent writer has asserted, every ach and pain, however slight, contributes something to the abbreviation of human life. And all these cures were effected by a few sugar pellets, tinctured with a liquid, which contained perhaps the decillionth of a grain of medicine!

Should homöopathie be, as, in spite of all this, it well may be, altogether false, it would still be desirable to impress with a notion of its truth those who are given to the mischievous practice of self-dosing. Here, it seems, would be no fear of adding to the victims of domestic pharmacy. The portability of the medicines is another advantage. Adieu to the endless train of phials, pots, pill-boxes, and powders! The very name of medicine-chest must cease to be. There lies before us, as we write, a small morocco case, about the size of a pocket Bible, within the compact dimensions of which are contained eighty-four little bottles of homöopathic pellets—enough to physic the crew of a first-rate on a voyage round the globe.

Such facts as we have above narrated—and the number might be considerably increased even from our own personal knowledge—are much insisted upon in support of the efficacy of the small doses. The number and the notoriety of the cures thus performed are, indeed, the main stumbling-block to the antagonists of Homöopathie. Any thing like an equal list of

well-established instances of failure would be the best possible answer to Hahnemann's whole system. But these his opponents do not adduce. We have found nothing of the sort in any of the replies to the *Organon*, which we have perused. The case of Prince Schwarzenburg is the only example of failure\* brought forward; and great stress is laid upon this by the Allopaths. That eminent person, after consulting Mahrenzeller, proceeded to take advice of the mighty Hahnemann himself at Leipsic. There he was lodged in the same apartments in which he had captured the king of Saxony in 1813; and there, as our guide assured us, he died upon the same day of the year, on which the royal prisoner had surrendered to him. Professor Sachs, indeed, intimates his suspicion, that Hahnemann gives larger doses in reality than those which his doctrines authorise; and that he retired to Köthen, his present place of residence, to avoid the detection which the Saxon law, against the preparation of their own drugs by physicians, must have occasioned. He adds, that a disciple of the Hahnemannic school, when permitted, under the inspection of a royal commission, to prescribe for hospital-patients in Berlin, was discovered attempting to baulk the vigilance of the commissioners, and to administer medicine to the sick by stealth. Homöopathie, however, is not responsible for the occasional sins of its insincere or unskilful votaries; and if there were any truth in the reason assigned by Sachs for Hahnemann's migration, it is obvious, that the same detection might easily be made in the practice of six homöopathic physicians still resident at Leipsic, who have to combat a host of about forty Allopaths, including all the medical Professors of the university.

Homöopathie deals in diet as well as drugs, and proceeds, in this respect, we are bound to say, upon a very simple and intelligible principle. A treatise upon regimen is generally written by some one, whose digestive organs are deranged, and who imagines the rest of mankind to be in the same predicament. He cannot eat butter, nor recline upon his left side, and so advises us all to repose on the dexter flank, and to abstain from

---

\* Another case of failure is talked of, but as a mere jest, in the social circle. A lady, attended by a homöopathic physician, had the indiscretion to die, in spite of his prescriptions. Amazed at this incongruity, the physician requested and obtained leave to examine the corpse; when, lo! in the insidious cavity of a decayed tooth, were found the unswallowed pellets, which must have wrought a cure, had they reached their proper destination.

the pleasing produce of the dairy. But there is no universal law for human stomachs. The Hahnemannists do not venture to enact one. They say only, while a patient is taking our tiny doses, he must give them fair play; he must not eat or drink any thing of a medicinal nature, or that would counteract the effect of our prescriptions. Hence all kinds of spices, pepper, mustard, all medicinal herbs, and such vegetables as garlic, onions, beet root, asparagus, horse-radish, turnips, are rigidly proscribed; of the feathered tribe, ducks, geese, and very juvenile chickens, are not to be eaten; young veal, lamb, pork, and too fat or too salt meats; spirits, liqueurs, and heady or undiluted wines; beer, vinegar, lemons, bitter almonds, the skin and noyau of fruits, are condemned. The use of strong perfumes, and of woollen next the skin, is likewise discouraged. The patient may wash *ad libitum*; but is not to bathe.\* Mental or bodily fatigue, anxious thoughts, and sorrowful recollections, are to be shunned as much as possible. A bore, a dun, a scolding wife, and, we suppose, a smoky chimney, are among the worst foes to a homœopathic cure. We tremble to add, that tea and coffee are among the articles forbidden. To coffee scarcely any quarter can be given; for Hahnemann has written a book solely upon the deleterious effects of this beverage; and if it be true, that two of the greatest men of this age, Bonaparte and Lord Byron,† died of using it, our readers will learn caution in time. But for British tea-drinkers we have some consolation to offer. A German patient is debarred from it, because tea is so little drunk in Germany, that it acts like medicine when taken by a native; and we have known persons in that country decline a cup of good bohea, with the excuse, ‘No, I thank you; I *am quite well at present.*’ The inveterate sipper of these parts need observe only to drink his tea very weak, and not more than once a day.

The list of permitted articles of food is sufficiently ample. Beef, mutton, veal of two months old, well-grown fowls, turkies, game, fish, potatoes, peas, beans, artichokes, spinnage, rice, wheat, barley, macaroni, sago, diluted wine of the lighter sorts, fruits, *compotes*, cocoa, milk, butter, cheese not very old; all these may be freely used, where there is no impediment in the

---

\* Venesection, indeed bleeding of all kinds, is much discouraged by the homœopaths. Crowded theatres, brilliant concerts, and other exciting scenes, are to be avoided while a patient is taking their prescriptions.

† *Hortator on the Simplicity of Health*, (p. 134) insinuates something like this.

patient's idiosyncrasy. We will add, that we have dined for three weeks consecutively at a foreign table, which could hardly be surpassed in the first establishments of England, and at which, nevertheless, every dish was in the strictest accordance with the rules of homöopathie.

Under this head, also, Dr Hahnemann is accused by Sachs of inconsistency. It appears that in former days he was even ludicrously liberal to patients in the article of diet. He thought nothing of permitting to a lady, just confined, the use of wine, beer, coffee, and meat at discretion, though now he forbids even the stimulation of lavender water. Of this objection we have disposed already when speaking of the exiguity of doses. Heinroth, on the other hand, condemns the homöopathic diet, because it is not *new*, and not copious enough in *positive* directions. But *negative* rules are the object of Hahnemann: he says you are not to eat, drink, or do anything hostile to the operations of my physic, but beyond that limitation you may follow your own fancy in all matters which you know not to be hurtful to your constitution.

While Dr Heinroth condemns the regimen enforced by Hahnemann, it is strange that in this very regimen he seeks for one solution of the wonders wrought by homöopathie. In four ways he attempts to find a key to these prodigies. I. The system may work like the *methodus exspatiativa*, by offering no violence to the organization, and leaving free scope for the energies of nature. Or the diseased sensibility of the nervous system may require a very slender operation of medicine; of narcotics, for example, which play a conspicuous part in the *materia medica* of Hahnemann, and the virtues of which are far from being yet fully understood. These principles have been already pointed out in the *Brownish system*, but there it is added that they are to be acted on only in a very high state of excitement; whereas, in diseases not merely nervous, much harm may be done by following them, especially in inflammatory cases. Why is it, then, that Heinroth produces no instance of these hurtful effects? and that, in inflammatory disorders above all others, the method of Hahnemann is said to be successful? II. The strong hopes raised in the patient by the confidence of his physician may be the cause of cure. But would this cause operate in the cases of children, or of insane persons, both of which classes are said to be frequently restored to health by homöopathie? III. The cures may be only apparent, and succeeded by fatal relapses. Again, we say, why not bring forward instances? Schwarzenburg died; but his case is alleged to have been hopeless before he consulted the homöopaths. Surely, if relapses

be frequent under their management, Dr Heinroth might adduce examples out of 42,000 inhabitants of Leipsic, in which number six homœopathic physicians are comprised. IV. The *diet* may be the true conjuror after all in these miracles. We know, from the history of old Cornaro and others, what great effects a strenuous attention to diet will produce; but, though in chronic cases, when months or even years are required by the homœopaths for insuring recovery, the diet may have prodigious influence, how will this apply to the treatment of acute complaints, in which a day or even less is sufficient for the operation of the medicine, and the patient's complete restoration? Here we have the '*cito, tuto, et jucunde*' of Celsus, realized.

On Hahnemann's History of Chronic Disorders we cannot bestow that degree of attention which the research and ingenuity displayed in it deserve; but those who find the principles of the *Organon* incredible or incomprehensible, will yet discover much curious and valuable matter in the first volume of *Die Chronischen Krankheiten*. He traces every disease of this description to some miasm, that has, at one time or other, infected the frame, and includes them all in their origin under three great heads, Syphilis, Sykosis, and Psora;—the first two being varieties of the venereal malady, and the last name applying to the wide range of cutaneous disorders, from leprosy down to the itch. He considers one-eighth of chronic complaints to originate in the venereal varieties, and the remaining seven-eighths to be the offspring of Psora.

Psora is the most ancient, as well as the most fruitful, of these terrible sources of disease. The oldest historical records describe it as extensively diffused. Moses\* speaks of several of its kinds. It was known too well to the Greeks, as well as to the Israelites, to the Arabs, and more recently to the Europeans of the middle ages. During that period it long bore the shape of St Anthony's fire, but the return of the Crusaders from the east in the 13th century, brought back the more dreadful form of leprosy; and to so great an extent, that in the year 1226, there were, in France alone, two thousand houses for the reception of lepers. Habits of growing refinement, and the means of greater cleanliness, did so much, however, to combat the outward mani-

---

\* In Leviticus, cap. xiii., and again, cap. xxi. v. 20, where he speaks of the corporeal blemishes which an officiating priest must be free from, Moses uses a word which the Alexandrian interpreters have rendered by *ψώρα ἀργία*, the Vulgate by *Scabies jugis*. *ψώρα* is likewise used by these interpreters in Deuteron. xxviii. 27.

festations of this disease, that towards the end of the 15th century, just when *syphilis* was beginning to appear, the external symptoms of Psora were reduced to a far milder form of cutaneous eruption. Still its miasm remained the most infectious of all, and the most widely propagated. We need not search for it alone in the crowded hospital, the manufactory, the prison, the poor-house, or the noisome abodes of penury; it is to be found in the most gorgeous and the most sequestered scenes;—in the saloons of princely extravagance, and in the rocky cell of the hermit. The chronic complaints derived from this origin are of different kinds and degrees of intensity, but their name is Legion. Nearly five hundred symptoms are enumerated in Hahnemann's description of them; and the terms of the common pathology, in which they are erroneously arranged as distinct diseases, are far from exhausting the modifications of this one many-headed and many-handed monster.

The treatment of Psora hitherto pursued has been, of course, according to Hahnemann, entirely wrong. It has been too general a rule to consider cutaneous eruption as a mere local evil, having its place upon the skin, by which the rest of the organization is not affected, and which may be safely and sufficiently removed by preparations of sulphur, zinc, quicksilver, &c. Hahnemann, on the contrary, affirms the cutaneous disorder to be only the outward indication of internal malady, which has penetrated the whole organization before it reveals itself upon the superficies of the body. By the removal of this outward indication, therefore, the inward pest acquires fresh vigour, and displays its augmented powers in a multiplicity of dismal forms. Twenty-five pages are filled with the melancholy catalogue of the results of such mistaken treatment; a catalogue supplied by the medical history of ages, down from the case of that Athenian mentioned in the fifth book *Ἐπιδημιῶν*, who died of dropsy from having banished a cutaneous eruption by the use of the warm baths of Melos. Homöopathic attacks Psora in all its shapes and stages, in the inward seat of disease; and is said to prove very efficacious in curing this class of chronic complaints, as well as syphilis and sycosis, with all their 'grisly family—more hideous ' than their queen.'



ART. XI.—*Sir Thomas More ; or Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society*. By ROBERT SOUTHEY, Esq. LL.D. Poet Laureate. 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1829.

IT would be scarcely possible for a man of Mr Southey's talents and acquirements to write two volumes so large as those before us, which should be wholly destitute of information and amusement. Yet we do not remember to have read with so little satisfaction any equal quantity of matter, written by any man of real abilities. We have, for some time past, observed with great regret the strange infatuation which leads the Poet-laureate to abandon those departments of literature in which he might excel, and to lecture the public on sciences of which he has still the very alphabet to learn. He has now, we think, done his worst. The subject which he has at last undertaken to treat is one which demands all the highest intellectual and moral qualities of a philosophical statesman,—an understanding at once comprehensive and acute,—a heart at once upright and charitable. Mr Southey brings to the task two faculties which were never, we believe, vouchsafed in measure so copious to any human being,—the faculty of believing without a reason, and the faculty of hating without a provocation.

It is, indeed, most extraordinary that a mind like Mr Southey's,—a mind richly endowed in many respects by nature, and highly cultivated by study,—a mind which has exercised considerable influence on the most enlightened generation of the most enlightened people that ever existed—should be utterly destitute of the power of discerning truth from falsehood. Yet such is the fact. Government is to Mr Southey one of the fine arts. He judges of a theory or a public measure, of a religion, a political party, a peace or a war, as men judge of a picture or a statue, by the effect produced on his imagination. A chain of associations is to him what a chain of reasoning is to other men ; and what he calls his opinions, are in fact merely his tastes.

Part of this description might, perhaps, apply to a much greater man, Mr Burke. But Mr Burke, assuredly, possessed an understanding admirably fitted for the investigation of truth,—an understanding stronger than that of any statesman, active or speculative, of the eighteenth century,—stronger than every thing, except his own fierce and ungovernable sensibility. Hence, he generally chose his side like a fanatic, and defended it like a philosopher. His conduct, in the most important events of his life,—at the time of the impeachment of Hastings, for example, and at the time of the French Revolution,—seems to have been

prompted by those feelings and motives, which Mr Coleridge has so happily described :

‘ Stormy pity, and the cherish’d lure  
Of pomp, and proud precipitance of soul.’

Hindustan, with its vast cities, its gorgeous pagodas, its infinite swarms of dusky population, its long-descended dynasties, its stately etiquette, excited in a mind so capacious, so imaginative, and so susceptible, the most intense interest. The peculiarities of the costume, of the manners, and of the laws, the very mystery which hung over the language and origin of the people, seized his imagination. To plead in Westminster Hall, in the name of the English people, at the bar of the English nobles, for great nations and kings separated from him by half the world, seemed to him the height of human glory. Again, it is not difficult to perceive, that his hostility to the French Revolution principally arose from the vexation which he felt, at having all his old political associations disturbed, at seeing the well-known boundary-marks of states obliterated, and the names and distinctions with which the history of Europe had been filled for ages, swept away. He felt like an antiquarian whose shield had been scoured, or a connoisseur, who found his Titian retouched. But however he came by an opinion, he had no sooner got it, than he did his best to make out a legitimate title to it. His reason, like a spirit in the service of an enchanter, though spell-bound, was still mighty. It did whatever work his passions and his imagination might impose. But it did that work, however arduous, with marvellous dexterity and vigour. His course was not determined by argument; but he could defend the wildest course by arguments more plausible, than those by which common men support opinions which they have adopted, after the fullest deliberation. Reason has scarcely ever displayed, even in those well-constituted minds of which she occupies the throne, so much power and energy as in the lowest offices of that imperial servitude.

Now, in the mind of Mr Southey, reason has no place at all, as either leader or follower, as either sovereign or slave. He does not seem to know what an argument is. He never uses arguments himself. He never troubles himself to answer the arguments of his opponents. It has never occurred to him, that a man ought to be able to give some better account of the way in which he has arrived at his opinions than merely that it is his will and pleasure to hold them,—that there is a difference between assertion and demonstration,—that a rumour does not always prove a fact,—that a fact does not always prove a theory,—that two contradictory propositions cannot be undeniable truths,

—that to beg the question, is not the way to settle it,—or that when an objection is raised, it ought to be met with something more convincing, than ‘scoundrel’ and ‘blockhead.’

It would be absurd to read the works of such a writer for political instruction. The utmost that can be expected from any system promulgated by him is that it may be splendid and affecting,—that it may suggest sublime and pleasing images. His scheme of philosophy is a mere day-dream, a poetical creation, like the Domdaniel caverns, the Swerga, or Padalon; and indeed, it bears no inconsiderable resemblance to those gorgeous visions. Like them, it has something of invention, grandeur, and brilliancy. But like them, it is grotesque and extravagant, and perpetually violates that conventional probability which is essential to the effect even of works of art.

The warmest admirers of Mr Southey will scarcely, we think, deny that his success has almost always borne an inverse proportion to the degree in which his undertakings have required a logical head. His poems, taken in the mass, stand far higher than his prose works. The Laureate Odes, indeed, among which the Vision of Judgment must be classed, are, for the most part, worse than Pye’s, and as bad as Cibber’s; nor do we think him generally happy in short pieces. But his longer poems, though full of faults, are nevertheless very extraordinary productions. We doubt greatly whether they will be read fifty years hence,—but that if they are read, they will be admired, we have no doubt whatever.

But though in general we prefer Mr Southey’s poetry to his prose, we must make one exception. The Life of Nelson is, beyond all doubt, the most perfect and the most delightful of his works. The fact is, as his poems most abundantly prove, that he is by no means so skilful in designing, as in filling up. It was therefore an advantage to him to be furnished with an outline of characters and events, and to have no other task to perform than that of touching the cold sketch into life. No writer, perhaps, ever lived, whose talents so precisely qualified him to write the history of the great naval warrior. There were no fine riddles of the human heart to read—no theories to found—no hidden causes to develope—no remote consequences to predict. The character of the hero lay on the surface. The exploits were brilliant and picturesque. The necessity of adhering to the real course of events saved Mr Southey from those faults which deform the original plan of almost every one of his poems, and which even his innumerable beauties of detail scarcely redeem. The subject did not require the exercise of those reasoning powers the want of which is the blemish of his prose. It would

not be easy to find in all literary history, an instance of a more exact hit between wind and water. John Wesley, and the Peninsular War, were subjects of a very different kind,—subjects which required all the qualities of a philosophic historian. In Mr Southey's works on these subjects, he has, on the whole, failed. Yet there are charming specimens of the art of narration in both of them. The *Life of Wesley* will probably live. Defective as it is, it contains the only popular account of a most remarkable moral revolution, and of a man whose eloquence and logical acuteness might have rendered him eminent in literature, whose genius for government was not inferior to that of Richelieu, and who, whatever his errors may have been, devoted all his powers, in defiance of obloquy and derision, to what he sincerely considered as the highest good of his species. The *History of the Peninsular War* is already dead:—indeed, the second volume was dead-born. The glory of producing an imperishable record of that great conflict seems to be reserved for Colonel Napier.

The *Book of the Church* contains some stories very prettily told. The rest is mere rubbish. The adventure was manifestly one which could be achieved only by a profound thinker, and in which even a profound thinker might have failed, unless his passions had been kept under strict control. In all those works in which Mr Southey has completely abandoned narration, and undertaken to argue moral and political questions, his failure has been complete and ignominious. On such occasions, his writings are rescued from utter contempt and derision solely by the beauty and purity of the English. We find, we confess, so great a charm in Mr Southey's style, that, even when he writes nonsense, we generally read it with pleasure, except indeed when he tries to be droll. A more insufferable jester never existed. He very often attempts to be humorous, and yet we do not remember a single occasion on which he has succeeded farther than to be quaintly and flippantly dull. In one of his works, he tells us that Bishop Sprat was very properly so called, inasmuch as he was a very small poet. And in the book now before us, he cannot quote Francis Bugg without a remark on his unsavoury name. A man might talk folly like this by his own fireside; but that any human being, after having made such a joke, should write it down, and copy it out, and transmit it to the printer, and correct the proof-sheets, and send it forth into the world, is enough to make us ashamed of our species.

The extraordinary bitterness of spirit which Mr Southey manifests towards his opponents is, no doubt, in a great measure to be attributed to the manner in which he forms his opinions. Differences of taste, it has often been remarked, produce greater ex-

asperation than differences on points of science. But this is not all. A peculiar austerity marks almost all Mr Southey's judgments of men and actions. We are far from blaming him for fixing on a high standard of morals, and for applying that standard to every case. But rigour ought to be accompanied by discernment, and of discernment Mr Southey seems to be utterly destitute. His mode of judging is monkish; it is exactly what we should expect from a stern old Benedictine, who had been preserved from many ordinary frailties by the restraints of his situation. No man out of a cloister ever wrote about love, for example, so coldly and at the same time so grossly. His descriptions of it are just what we should hear from a recluse, who knew the passion only from the details of the confessional. Almost all his heroes make love either like seraphim or like cattle. He seems to have no notion of any thing between the Platonic passion of the Glendoveer, who gazes with rapture on his mistress's leprosy, and the brutal appetite of Arvalan and Roderick. In Roderick, indeed, the two characters are united. He is first all clay, and then all spirit; he goes forth a Tarquin, and comes back too ethereal to be married. The only love-scene, as far as we can recollect, in *Madoc*, consists of the delicate attentions which a savage, who has drunk too much of the Prince's metheglin, offers to Goervyl. It would be the labour of a week to find, in all the vast mass of Mr Southey's poetry, a single passage indicating any sympathy with those feelings which have consecrated the shades of Vaucluse and the rocks of Meilleric.

Indeed, if we except some very pleasing images of paternal tenderness and filial duty, there is scarcely any thing soft or humane in Mr Southey's poetry. What theologians call the spiritual sins are his cardinal virtues—hatred, pride, and the insatiable thirst of vengeance. These passions he disguises under the name of duties; he purifies them from the alloy of vulgar interests; he ennobles them by uniting them with energy, fortitude, and a severe sanctity of manners, and then holds them up to the admiration of mankind. This is the spirit of *Thalaba*, of *Ladurlad*, of *Adosinda*, of *Roderick* after his regeneration. 'It is the spirit which, in all his writings, Mr Southey appears to affect. 'I do well to be angry,' seems to be the predominant feeling of his mind. Almost the only mark of charity which he vouchsafes to his opponents is to pray for their conversion, and this he does in terms not unlike those in which we can imagine a Portuguese priest interceding with Heaven for a Jew, delivered over to the secular arm after a relapse.

We have always heard, and fully believe, that Mr Southey is a very amiable and humane man; nor do we intend to apply to

him personally any of the remarks which we have made on the spirit of his writings. Such are the caprices of human nature. Even Uncle Toby troubled himself very little about the French grenadiers who fell on the glacis of Namur. And when Mr Southey takes up his pen, he changes his nature as much as Captain Shandy when he girt on his sword. The only opponents to whom he gives quarter are those in whom he finds something of his own character reflected. He seems to have an instinctive antipathy for calm, moderate men—for men who shun extremes and who render reasons. He has treated Mr Owen of Lanark, for example, with infinitely more respect than he has shown to Mr Hallam or to Dr Lingard; and this for no reason that we can discover, except that Mr Owen is more unreasonably and hopelessly in the wrong than any speculator of our time.

Mr Southey's political system is just what we might expect from a man who regards politics, not as a matter of science, but as a matter of taste and feeling. All his schemes of government have been inconsistent with themselves. In his youth he was a republican; yet, as he tells us in his preface to these *Colloquies*, he was even then opposed to the Catholic claims. He is now a violent Ultra-Tory. Yet while he maintains, with vehemence approaching to ferocity, all the sterner and harsher parts of the Ultra-Tory theory of government, the baser and dirtier part of that theory disgusts him. Exclusion, persecution, severe punishments for libellers and demagogues, proscriptions, massacres, civil war, if necessary, rather than any concession to a discontented people,—these are the measures which he seems inclined to recommend. A severe and gloomy tyranny—crushing opposition—silencing remonstrance—drilling the minds of the people into unreasoning obedience,—has in it something of grandeur which delights his imagination. But there is nothing fine in the shabby tricks and jobs of office. And Mr Southey, accordingly, has no toleration for them. When a democrat, he did not perceive that his system led logically, and would have led practically, to the removal of religious distinctions. He now commits a similar error. He renounces the abject and paltry part of the creed of his party, without perceiving that it is also an essential part of that creed. He would have tyranny and purity together; though the most superficial observation might have shown him that there can be no tyranny without corruption.

It is high time, however, that we should proceed to the consideration of the work, which is our more immediate subject, and which, indeed, illustrates in almost every page our general remarks on Mr Southey's writings. In the preface, we are in-

formed that the author, notwithstanding some statements to the contrary, was always opposed to the Catholic Claims. We fully believe this; both because we are sure that Mr Southey is incapable of publishing a deliberate falsehood, and because his averment is in itself probable. It is exactly what we should have expected that, even in his wildest paroxysms of democratic enthusiasm, Mr Southey would have felt no wish to see a simple remedy applied to a great practical evil; that the only measure which all the great statesmen of two generations have agreed with each other in supporting, would be the only measure which Mr Southey would have agreed with himself in opposing. He has passed from one extreme of political opinion to another, as Satan in Milton went round the globe, contriving constantly to 'ride with darkness.' Wherever the thickest shadow of the night may at any moment chance to fall, there is Mr Southey. It is not every body who could have so dexterously avoided blundering on the daylight in the course of a journey to the Antipodes.

Mr Southey has not been fortunate in the plan of any of his fictitious narratives. But he has never failed so conspicuously, as in the work before us; except, indeed, in the wretched *Vision of Judgment*. In November 1817, it seems, the Laureate was sitting over his newspaper, and meditating about the death of the Princess Charlotte. An elderly person, of very dignified aspect, makes his appearance, announces himself as a stranger from a distant country, and apologises very politely for not having provided himself with letters of introduction. Mr Southey supposes his visitor to be some American gentleman, who has come to see the lakes and the lake-poets, and accordingly proceeds to perform, with that grace which only long experience can give, all the duties which authors owe to starers. He assures his guest that some of the most agreeable visits which he has received have been from Americans, and that he knows men among them whose talents and virtues would do honour to any country. In passing, we may observe, to the honour of Mr Southey, that, though he evidently has no liking for the American institutions, he never speaks of the people of the United States with that pitiful affectation of contempt by which some members of his party have done more than wars or tariffs can do to excite mutual enmity between two communities formed for mutual friendship. Great as the faults of his mind are, paltry spite like this has no place in it. Indeed, it is scarcely conceivable that a man of his sensibility and his imagination should look without pleasure and national pride on the vigorous and splendid youth of a great people, whose veins are filled with our

blood, whose minds are nourished with our literature, and on whom is entailed the rich inheritance of our civilisation, our freedom, and our glory.

But we must return to Mr Southey's study at Keswick. The visitor informs the hospitable poet that he is not an American, but a spirit. Mr Southey, with more frankness than civility, tells him that he is a very queer one. The stranger holds out his hand. It has neither weight nor substance. Mr Southey upon this becomes more serious; his hair stands on end; and he adjures the spectre to tell him what he is, and why he comes. The ghost turns out to be Sir Thomas More. The traces of martyrdom, it seems, are worn in the other world, as stars and ribbands are worn in this. Sir Thomas shows the poet a red streak round his neck, brighter than a ruby, and informs him that Cranmer wears a suit of flames in paradise,—the right hand glove, we suppose, of peculiar brilliancy.

Sir Thomas pays but a short visit on this occasion, but promises to cultivate the new acquaintance which he has formed, and, after begging that his visit may be kept secret from Mrs Southey, vanishes into air.

The rest of the book consists of conversations between Mr Southey and the spirit about trade, currency, Catholic emancipation, periodical literature, female nunneries, butchers, snuff, book-stalls, and a hundred other subjects. Mr Southey very hospitably takes an opportunity to lionize the ghost round the lakes, and directs his attention to the most beautiful points of view. Why a spirit was to be evoked for the purpose of talking over such matters, and seeing such sights—why the vicar of the parish, a blue-stocking from London, or an American, such as Mr Southey supposed his aerial visitor to be, might not have done as well—we are unable to conceive. Sir Thomas tells Mr Southey nothing about future events, and indeed absolutely disclaims the gift of prescience. He has learned to talk modern English: he has read all the new publications, and loves a jest as well as when he jested with the executioner, though we cannot say that the quality of his wit has materially improved in Paradise. His powers of reasoning, too, are by no means in as great vigour as when he sate on the woolsack; and though he boasts that he is 'divested of all those passions which cloud the intellects and warp the understandings of men,' we think him—we must confess—far less stoical than formerly. As to revelations, he tells Mr Southey at the outset to expect none from him. The Laureate expresses some doubts, which assuredly will not raise him in the opinion of our modern millennarians, as to the divine authority of the Apocalypse.



But the ghost preserves an impenetrable silence. As far as we remember, only one hint about the employments of disembodied spirits escapes him. He encourages Mr Southey to hope that there is a Paradise Press, at which all the valuable publications of Mr Murray and Mr Colburn are reprinted as regularly as at Philadelphia; and delicately insinuates, that *Thalaba* and the *Curse of Kehama* are among the number. What a contrast does this absurd fiction present to those charming narratives which Plato and Cicero prefixed to their dialogues! What cost in machinery, yet what poverty of effect! A ghost brought in to say what any man might have said! The glorified spirit of a great statesman and philosopher dawdling, like a bilious old Nabob at a watering-place, over quarterly reviews and novels—dropping in to pay long calls—making excursions in search of the picturesque! The scene of *St George and St Denys* in the *Pucelle* is hardly more ridiculous. We know what Voltaire meant. Nobody, however, can suppose that Mr Southey means to make game of the mysteries of a higher state of existence. The fact is, that in the work before us, in the *Vision of Judgment*, and in some of his other pieces, his mode of treating the most solemn subjects differs from that of open scoffers only as the extravagant representations of sacred persons and things in some grotesque Italian paintings differ from the caricatures which Carlile exposes in the front of his shop. We interpret the particular act by the general character. What in the window of a convicted blasphemous we call blasphemous, we call only absurd and ill-judged in an altar-piece.

We now come to the conversations which pass between Mr Southey and Sir Thomas Moore, or rather between two Southeys, equally eloquent, equally angry, equally unreasonable, and equally given to talking about what they do not understand. Perhaps we could not select a better instance of the spirit which pervades the whole book than the discussion touching butchers. These persons are represented as castaways, as men whose employment hebetates the faculties and hardens the heart;—not that the poet has any scruples about the use of animal food. He acknowledges that it is for the good of the animals themselves that men should feed upon them. ‘Nevertheless,’ says he, ‘I cannot but acknowledge, like good old John Fox, that ‘the sight of a slaughter-house or shambles, if it does not disturb ‘this clear conviction, excites in me uneasiness and pain, as well ‘as loathing. And that they produce a worse effect upon the ‘persons employed in them,’ is a fact acknowledged by that ‘law or custom which excludes such persons from sitting on ‘juries upon cases of life and death.’

This is a fair specimen of Mr Southey's mode of looking at all moral questions. Here is a body of men engaged in an employment, which, by his own account, is beneficial, not only to mankind, but to the very creatures on whom we feed. Yet he represents them as men who are necessarily reprobates—as men who must necessarily be reprobates, even in the most improved state of society—even, to use his own phrase, in a Christian Utopia. And what reasons are given for a judgment so directly opposed to every principle of sound and manly morality? Merely this, that he cannot abide the sight of their apparatus—that, from certain peculiar associations, he is affected with disgust when he passes by their shops. He gives, indeed, another reason; a certain law or custom, which never existed but in the imaginations of old women, and which, if it had existed, would have proved just as much against butchers as the ancient prejudice against the practice of taking interest for money, proves against the merchants of England. Is a surgeon a castaway? We believe that nurses, when they instruct children in that venerable law or custom which Mr Southey so highly approves, generally join the surgeon to the butcher. A dissecting-room would, we should think, affect the nerves of most people as much as a butcher's shambles. But the most amusing circumstance is, that Mr Southey, who detests a butcher, should look with special favour on a soldier. He seems highly to approve of the sentiment of General Meadows, who swore that a grenadier was the highest character in this world or in the next; and assures us, that a virtuous soldier is placed in the situation which most tends to his improvement, and will most promote his eternal interests. Human blood, indeed, is by no means an object of so much loathing to Mr Southey, as the hides and paunches of cattle. In 1814, he poured forth poetical maledictions on all who talked of peace with Buonaparte. He went over the field of Waterloo,—a field, beneath which twenty thousand of the stoutest hearts that ever beat are mouldering,—and came back in an ecstasy, which he mistook for poetical inspiration. In most of his poems,—particularly in his best poem, *Roderic*,—and in most of his prose works, particularly in *The History of the Peninsular War*, he shows a delight in snuffing up carnage, which would not have misbecome a Scandinavian bard, but which sometimes seems to harmonize ill with the Christian morality. We do not, however, blame Mr Southey for exulting, even a little ferociously, in the brave deeds of his countrymen, or for finding something 'comely and reviving' in the bloody vengeance inflicted by an oppressed people on its oppressors. Now, surely, if we find that a man whose business is to kill Frenchmen may be

humane, we may hope that means may be found to render a man humane whose business is to kill sheep. If the brutalizing effect of such scenes as the storm of St Sebastian may be counteracted, we may hope that in a Christian Utopia, some minds might be proof against the kennels and dressers of Aldgate. Mr Southey's feeling, however, is easily explained. A butcher's knife is by no means so elegant as a sabre, and a calf does not bleed with half the grace of a poor wounded hussar.

It is in the same manner that Mr Southey appears to have formed his opinion of the manufacturing system. There is nothing which he hates so bitterly. It is, according to him, a system more tyrannical than that of the feudal ages,—a system of actual servitude,—a system which destroys the bodies and degrades the minds of those who are engaged in it. He expresses a hope that the competition of other nations may drive us out of the field; that our foreign trade may decline, and that we may thus enjoy a restoration of national sanity and strength. But he seems to think that the extermination of the whole manufacturing population would be a blessing, if the evil could be removed in no other way.

Mr Southey does not bring forward a single fact in support of these views, and, as it seems to us, there are facts which lead to a very different conclusion. In the first place, the poor-rate is very decidedly lower in the manufacturing than in the agricultural districts. If Mr Southey will look over the Parliamentary returns on this subject, he will find that the amount of parish relief required by the labourers in the different counties of England, is almost exactly in inverse proportion to the degree in which the manufacturing system has been introduced into those counties. The returns for the years ending in March 1825, and in March 1828, are now before us. In the former year, we find the poor-rate highest in Sussex,—about 20s. to every inhabitant. Then come Buckinghamshire, Essex, Suffolk, Bedfordshire, Huntingdonshire, Kent, and Norfolk. In all these the rate is above 15s. a-head. We will not go through the whole. Even in Westmoreland, and the North Riding of Yorkshire, the rate is at more than 8s. In Cumberland and Monmouthshire, the most fortunate of all the agricultural districts, it is at 6s. But in the West Riding of Yorkshire, it is as low as 5s.; and when we come to Lancashire, we find it at 4s.,—one-fifth of what it is in Sussex. The returns of the year ending in March 1828, are a little, and but a little, more unfavourable to the manufacturing districts. Lancashire, even in that season of distress, required a smaller poor-rate than any other district, and little more than one-fourth of the poor-rate raised in Sussex. Cumberland alone, of the agricultural districts, was as well off as

the West Riding of Yorkshire. These facts seem to indicate that the manufacturer is both in a more comfortable and in a less dependent situation than the agricultural labourer.

As to the effect of the manufacturing system on the bodily health, we must beg leave to estimate it by a standard far too low and vulgar for a mind so imaginative as that of Mr Southey—the proportion of births and deaths. We know that, during the growth of this atrocious system—this new misery,—(we use the phrases of Mr Southey,)—this new enormity—this birth of a portentous age—this pest, which no man can approve whose heart is not seared, or whose understanding has not been darkened—there has been a great diminution of mortality—and that this diminution has been greater in the manufacturing towns than anywhere else. The mortality still is, as it always was, greater in towns than in the country. But the difference has diminished in an extraordinary degree. There is the best reason to believe, that the annual mortality of Manchester, about the middle of the last century, was one in twenty-eight. It is now reckoned at one in forty-five. In Glasgow and Leeds a similar improvement has taken place. Nay, the rate of mortality in those three great capitals of the manufacturing districts, is now considerably less than it was fifty years ago over England and Wales taken together—open country and all. We might with some plausibility maintain, that the people live longer because they are better fed, better lodged, better clothed, and better attended in sickness; and that these improvements are owing to that increase of national wealth which the manufacturing system has produced.

Much more might be said on this subject. But to what end? It is not from bills of mortality and statistical tables that Mr Southey has learned his political creed. He cannot stoop to study the history of the system which he abuses—to strike the balance between the good and evil which it has produced—to compare district with district, or generation with generation. We will give his own reason for his opinion—the only reason which he gives for it—in his own words:

‘ We remained awhile in silence, looking upon the assemblage of dwellings below. Here, and in the adjoining hamlet of Millbeck, the effects of manufactures and of agriculture may be seen and compared. The old cottages are such as the poet and the painter equally delight in beholding. Substantially built of the native stone without mortar, dirtied with no white lime, and their long, low roofs covered with slate, if they had been raised by the magic of some indigenous Amphion's music, the materials could not have adjusted themselves more beautifully in accord with the surrounding scene; and time has still further harmonized them with wea-

ther-stains, lichens, and moss, short grasses, and short fern, and stone-plants of various kinds. The ornamented chimneys, round or square, less adorned than those which, like little turrets, crest the houses of the Portuguese peasantry; and yet not less happily suited to their place, the hedge of clipt box beneath the windows, the rose-bushes beside the door, the little patch of flower-ground, with its tall hollyocks in front; the garden beside, the bee-hives, and the orchard with its bank of daffodils and snow-drops, the earliest and the profusest in these parts, indicate in the owners some portion of ease and leisure, some regard to neatness and comfort, some sense of natural, and innocent, and healthful enjoyment. The new cottages of the manufacturers are upon the manufacturing pattern—naked, and in a row.

‘How is it, said I, that every thing which is connected with manufactures presents such features of unqualified deformity? From the largest of Mammon’s temples down to the poorest hovel in which his helotry are stalled, these edifices have all one character. Time will not mellow them; nature will neither clothe nor conceal them; and they will remain always as offensive to the eye as to the mind.’

Here is wisdom. Here are the principles on which nations are to be governed. Rose-bushes and poor-rates, rather than steam-engines and independence. Mortality and cottages with weather-stains, rather than health and long life with edifices which time cannot mellow. We are told, that our age has invented atrocities beyond the imagination of our fathers; that society has been brought into a state, compared with which extermination would be a blessing;—and all because the dwellings of cotton-spinners are naked and rectangular. Mr Southey has found out a way, he tells us, in which the effects of manufactures and agriculture may be compared. And what is this way? To stand on a hill, to look at a cottage and a manufactory, and to see which is the prettier. Does Mr Southey think that the body of the English peasantry live, or ever lived, in substantial and ornamented cottages, with box-hedges, flower-gardens, bee-hives, and orchards? If not, what is his parallel worth? We despise those *filosofastri*, who think that they serve the cause of science by depreciating literature and the fine arts. But if any thing could excuse their narrowness of mind, it would be such a book as this. It is not strange that when one enthusiast makes the picturesque the test of political good, another should feel inclined to proscribe altogether the pleasures of taste and imagination.

Thus it is that Mr Southey reasons about matters with which he thinks himself perfectly conversant. We cannot, therefore, be surprised to find that he commits extraordinary blunders when he writes on points of which he acknowledges himself to be ignorant. He confesses that he is not versed in political

economy—that he has neither liking nor aptitude for it; and he then proceeds to read the public a lecture concerning it which fully bears out his confession.

‘All wealth,’ says Sir Thomas More, ‘in former times was tangible. It consisted in land, money, or chattels, which were either of real or conventional value.’

Montesinos, as Mr Southey somewhat affectedly calls himself, answers :

‘Jewels, for example, and pictures, as in Holland,—where indeed at one time tulip bulbs answered the same purpose.’

‘That bubble,’ says Sir Thomas, ‘was one of those contagious insanities to which communities are subject. All wealth was real, till the extent of commerce rendered a paper currency necessary; which differed from precious stones and pictures in this important point, that there was no limit to its production.’

‘We regard it,’ says Montesinos, ‘as the representative of real wealth; and, therefore, limited always to the amount of what it represents.’

‘Pursue that notion,’ answers the ghost, ‘and you will be in the dark presently. Your provincial bank-notes, which constitute almost wholly the circulating medium of certain districts, pass current to-day. To-morrow, tidings may come that the house which issued them has stopt payment, and what do they represent then? You will find them the shadow of a shade.’

We scarcely know at which end to begin to disentangle this knot of absurdities. We might ask, why it should be a greater proof of insanity in men to set a high value on rare tulips than on rare stones, which are neither more useful nor more beautiful? We might ask, how it can be said that there is no limit to the production of paper-money, when a man is hanged if he issues any in the name of another, and is forced to cash what he issues in his own? But Mr Southey’s error lies deeper still. ‘All wealth,’ says he, ‘was tangible and real till paper currency was introduced.’ Now, was there ever, since men emerged from a state of utter barbarism, an age in which there were no debts? Is not a debt, while the solvency of the debtor is undoubted, always reckoned as part of the wealth of the creditor? Yet is it tangible and real wealth? Does it cease to be wealth, because there is the security of a written acknowledgment for it? And what else is paper currency? Did Mr Southey ever read a bank-note? If he did, he would see that it is a written acknowledgment of a debt, and a promise to pay that debt. The promise may be violated—the debt may remain unpaid—those to whom it was due may suffer: but this is a risk not confined to cases of

paper currency—it is a risk inseparable from the relation of debtor and creditor. Every man who sells goods for any thing but ready money, runs the risk of finding that what he considered as part of his wealth one day is nothing at all the next day. Mr Southey refers to the picture-galleries of Holland. The pictures were undoubtedly real and tangible possessions. But surely it might happen, that a burgomaster might owe a picture-dealer a thousand guilders for a Teniers. What in this case corresponds to our paper money is not the picture, which is tangible, but the claim of the picture-dealer on his customer for the price of the picture, which is not tangible. Now, would not the picture-dealer consider this claim as part of his wealth? Would not a tradesman who knew of it give credit to the picture-dealer the more readily on account of it? The burgomaster might be ruined. If so, would not those consequences follow which, as Mr Southey tells us, were never heard of till paper money came into use? Yesterday this claim was worth a thousand guilders. To-day what is it? The shadow of a shade.

It is true, that the more readily claims of this sort are transferred from hand to hand, the more extensive will be the injury produced by a single failure. The laws of all nations sanction, in certain cases, the transfer of rights not yet reduced into possession. Mr Southey would scarcely wish, we should think, that all indorsements of bills and notes should be declared invalid. Yet even if this were done, the transfer of claims would imperceptibly take place to a very great extent. When the baker trusts the butcher, for example, he is in fact, though not in form, trusting the butcher's customers. A man who owes large bills to tradesmen and fails to pay them, almost always produces distress through a very wide circle of people whom he never dealt with.

In short, what Mr Southey takes for a difference in kind, is only a difference of form and degree. In every society men have claims on the property of others. In every society there is a possibility that some debtors may not be able to fulfil their obligations. In every society, therefore, there is wealth which is not tangible, and which may become the shadow of a shade.

Mr Southey then proceeds to a dissertation on the national debt, which he considers in a new and most consolatory light, as a clear addition to the income of the country.

'You can understand,' says Sir Thomas, 'that it constitutes a great part of the national wealth.'

'So large a part,' answers Montesinos, 'that the interest amounted, during the prosperous time of agriculture, to as much as the rental of all the land in Great Britain; and at

‘ present to the rental of all lands, all houses, and all other fixed property put together.’

The Ghost and the Laureate agree that it is very desirable that there should be so secure and advantageous a deposit for wealth as the funds afford. Sir Thomas then proceeds :

‘ Another and far more momentous benefit must not be overlooked ; the expenditure of an annual interest, equalling, as you have stated, the present rental of all fixed property.’

‘ That expenditure,’ quoth Montesinos, ‘ gives employment to half the industry in the kingdom, and feeds half the mouths. Take, indeed, the weight of the national debt from this great and complicated social machine, and the wheels must stop.’

From this passage we should have been inclined to think, that Mr Southey supposes the dividends to be a free-gift periodically sent down from heaven to the fundholders, as quails and manna were sent to the Israelites ; were it not that he has vouchsafed, in the following question and answer, to give the public some information which, we believe, was very little needed.

‘ Whence comes the interest ?’ says Sir Thomas.

‘ It is raised,’ answers Montesinos, ‘ by taxation.’

Now, has Mr Southey ever considered what would be done with this sum if it were not paid as interest to the national creditor ? If he would think over this matter for a short time, we suspect that the ‘ momentous benefit’ of which he talks would appear to him to shrink strangely in amount. A fundholder, we will suppose, spends an income of five hundred pounds a-year, and his ten nearest neighbours pay fifty pounds each to the tax-gatherer, for the purpose of discharging the interest of the national debt. If the debt were wiped out—a measure, be it understood, which we by no means recommend—the fundholder would cease to spend his five hundred pounds a-year. He would no longer give employment to industry, or put food into the mouths of labourers. This Mr Southey thinks a fearful evil. But is there no mitigating circumstance ? Each of his ten neighbours has fifty pounds more than formerly. Each of them will, as it seems to our feeble understandings, employ more industry, and feed more mouths, than formerly. The sum is exactly the same. It is in different hands. But on what grounds does Mr Southey call upon us to believe that it is in the hands of men who will spend less liberally or less judiciously ? He seems to think, that nobody but a fundholder can employ the poor ; that if a tax is remitted, those who formerly used to pay it proceed immediately to dig holes in the earth, and bury the sum which the government had been accustomed to take ; that no money



can set industry in motion till it has been taken by the tax-gatherer out of one man's pocket and put into another man's. We really wish that Mr Southey would try to prove this principle, which is indeed the foundation of his whole theory of finance; for we think it right to hint to him, that our hard-hearted and unimaginative generation will expect some more satisfactory reason than the only one with which he has yet favoured it,—a similitude touching evaporation and dew.

Both the theory and the illustration, indeed, are old friends of ours. In every season of distress which we can remember, Mr Southey has been proclaiming that it is not from economy, but from increased taxation, that the country must expect relief; and he still, we find, places the undoubting faith of a political Diafoirus, in his

‘*Resaignare. repurgare, et reclysterizare.*’

‘A people,’ he tells us, ‘may be too rich, but a government cannot be so.’

‘A state,’ says he, ‘cannot have more wealth at its command than may be employed for the general good, a liberal expenditure in national works being one of the surest means for promoting national prosperity; and the benefit being still more obvious, of an expenditure directed to the purposes of national improvement. But a people may be too rich.’

We fully admit, that a state cannot have at its command more wealth than *may be* employed for the general good. But neither can individuals, or bodies of individuals, have at their command more wealth than *may be* employed for the general good. If there be no limit to the sum which may be usefully laid out in public works and national improvement, then wealth, whether in the hands of private men or of the government, *may* always, if the possessors choose to spend it usefully, be usefully spent. The only ground, therefore, on which Mr Southey can possibly maintain that a government cannot be too rich, but that a people may be too rich, must be this, that governments are more likely to spend their money on good objects than private individuals.

But what is useful expenditure? ‘A liberal expenditure in national works,’ says Mr Southey, ‘is one of the surest means for promoting national prosperity.’ What does he mean by national prosperity? Does he mean the wealth of the state? If so, his reasoning runs thus:—The more wealth a state has the better; for the more wealth a state has, the more wealth it will have. This is surely something like that fallacy, which is ungallantly termed a lady's reason. If by national prosperity he

means the wealth of the people, of how gross a contradiction is he guilty. A people, he tells us, may be too rich—a government cannot—for a government can employ its riches in making the people richer. The wealth of the people is to be taken from them, because they have too much, and laid out in works which will yield them more.

We are really at a loss to determine whether Mr Southey's reason for recommending large taxation is that it will make the people rich, or that it will make them poor. But we are sure, that if his object is to make them rich, he takes the wrong course. There are two or three principles respecting public works, which, as an experience of vast extent proves, may be trusted in almost every case.

It scarcely ever happens, that any private man, or body of men, will invest property in a canal, a tunnel, or a bridge, but from an expectation that the outlay will be profitable to them. No work of this sort can be profitable to private speculators, unless the public be willing to pay for the use of it. The public will not pay of their own accord for what yields no profit or convenience to them. There is thus a direct and obvious connexion between the motive which induces individuals to undertake such a work, and the utility of the work.

Can we find any such connexion in the case of a public work executed by a government? If it is useful, are the individuals who rule the country richer? If it is useless, are they poorer? A public man may be solicitous for his credit: but is not he likely to gain more credit by an useless display of ostentatious architecture in a great town, than by the best road or the best canal in some remote province? The fame of public works is a much less certain test of their utility, than the amount of toll collected at them. In a corrupt age, there will be direct embezzlement. In the purest age, there will be abundance of jobbing. Never were the statesmen of any country more sensitive to public opinion, and more spotless in pecuniary transactions, than those who have of late governed England. Yet we have only to look at the buildings recently erected in London for a proof of our rule. In a bad age, the fate of the public is to be robbed. In a good age, it is much milder—merely to have the dearest and the worst of every thing.

Buildings for state purposes the state must erect. And here we think that, in general, the state ought to stop. We firmly believe, that five hundred thousand pounds subscribed by individuals for rail-roads or canals would produce more advantage to the public than five millions voted by Parliament for the same purpose. There are certain old saws about the master's

eye and about every body's business, in which we place very great faith.

There is, we have said, no consistency in Mr Southey's political system. But if there be in it any leading principle, if there be any one error which diverges more widely and variously than any other, it is that of which his theory about national works is a ramification. He conceives that the business of the magistrate is, not merely to see that the persons and property of the people are secure from attack, but that he ought to be a perfect jack-of-all-trades,—architect, engineer, schoolmaster, merchant, theologian,—a Lady Bountiful in every parish,—a Paul Pry in every house, spying, eaves-dropping, relieving, admonishing, spending our money for us, and choosing our opinions for us. His principle is, if we understand it rightly, that no man can do any thing so well for himself, as his rulers, be they who they may, can do it for him; that a government approaches nearer and nearer to perfection, in proportion as it interferes more and more with the habits and notions of individuals.

He seems to be fully convinced, that it is in the power of government to relieve the distresses under which the lower orders labour. Nay, he considers doubt on this subject as impious. We cannot refrain from quoting his argument on this subject. It is a perfect jewel of logic.

‘Many thousands in your metropolis,’ says Sir Thomas More, ‘rise every morning without knowing how they are to subsist during the day; as many of them, where they are to lay their heads at night. All men, even the vicious themselves, know that wickedness leads to misery; but many, even among the good and the wise, have yet to learn that misery is almost as often the cause of wickedness.’

‘There are many,’ says Montesinos, ‘who know this, but believe that it is not in the power of human institutions to prevent this misery. They see the effect, but regard the causes as inseparable from the condition of human nature.’

‘As surely as God is good,’ replies Sir Thomas, ‘so surely there is no such thing as necessary evil. For, by the religious mind, sickness, and pain, and death, are not to be accounted evil.’

Now, if sickness, pain, and death, are not evils, we cannot understand why it should be an evil that thousands should rise without knowing how they are to subsist. The only evil of hunger is, that it produces first pain, then sickness, and finally death. If it did not produce these it would be no calamity. If these are not evils, it is no calamity. We cannot conceive why it should be a greater impeachment of the Divine goodness, that some men should not be able to find food to eat, than that others should have stomachs which derive no nourishment from food

when they have eaten it. Whatever physical effects want produces may also be produced by disease. Whatever salutary effects disease may produce, may also be produced by want. If poverty makes men thieves, disease and pain often sour the temper and contract the heart.

We will propose a very plain dilemma : Either physical pain is an evil, or it is not an evil. If it is an evil, then there is necessary evil in the universe : If it is not, why should the poor be delivered from it ?

Mr Southey entertains as exaggerated a notion of the wisdom of governments as of their power. He speaks with the greatest disgust of the respect now paid to public opinion. That opinion is, according to him, to be distrusted and dreaded ; its usurpation ought to be vigorously resisted ; and the practice of yielding to it is likely to ruin the country. To maintain police is, according to him, only one of the ends of government. Its duties are patriarchal and paternal. It ought to consider the moral discipline of the people as its first object, to establish a religion, to train the whole community in that religion, and to consider all dissenters as its own enemies.

‘ Nothing,’ says Sir Thomas, ‘ is more certain, than that religion is the basis upon which civil government rests ; that from religion power derives its authority, laws their efficacy, and both their zeal and sanction ; and it is necessary that this religion be established as for the security of the state, and for the welfare of the people, who would otherwise be moved to and fro with every wind of doctrine. A state is secure in proportion as the people are attached to its institutions ; it is, therefore, the first and plainest rule of sound policy, that the people be trained up in the way they should go. The state that neglects this prepares its own destruction ; and they who train them in any other way are undermining it. Nothing in abstract science can be more certain than these positions are.’

‘ All of which,’ answers Montesinos, ‘ are nevertheless denied by our professors of the arts Babblative and Scribbulative ; some in the audacity of evil designs, and others in the glorious assurance of impenetrable ignorance.’

The greater part of the two volumes before us is merely an amplification of these absurd paragraphs. What does Mr Southey mean by saying, that religion is demonstrably the basis of civil government ? He cannot surely mean that men have no motives except those derived from religion for establishing and supporting civil government, that no temporal advantage is derived from civil government, that man would experience no temporal inconvenience from living in a state of anarchy ? If he allows, as we think he must allow, that it is for the good of mankind in this world to have civil government, and that the

great majority of mankind have always thought it for their good in this world to have civil government, we then have a basis for government quite distinct from religion. It is true, that the Christian religion sanctions government, as it sanctions every thing which promotes the happiness and virtue of our species. But we are at a loss to conceive in what sense religion can be said to be the basis of government, in which it is not also the basis of the practices of eating, drinking, and lighting fires in cold weather. Nothing in history is more certain than that government has existed, has received some obedience and given some protection, in times in which it derived no support from religion,—in times in which there was no religion that influenced the hearts and lives of men. It was not from dread of Tartarus, or belief in the Elysian fields, that an Athenian wished to have some institutions which might keep Orestes from filching his cloak, or Midias from breaking his head. ‘It is from religion,’ says Mr Southey, ‘that power derives its authority, and laws ‘their efficacy.’ From what religion does our power over the Hindoos derive its authority, or the law in virtue of which we hang Brahmins its efficacy? For thousands of years civil government has existed in almost every corner of the world,—in ages of priestcraft,—in ages of fanaticism,—in ages of Epicurean indifference,—in ages of enlightened piety. However pure or impure the faith of the people might be, whether they adored a beneficent or a malignant power, whether they thought the soul mortal or immortal, they have, as soon as they ceased to be absolute savages, found out their need of civil government, and instituted it accordingly. It is as universal as the practice of cookery. Yet, it is as certain, says Mr Southey, as any thing in abstract science, that government is founded on religion. We should like to know what notion Mr Southey has of the demonstrations of abstract science. But a vague one, we suspect.

The proof proceeds. As religion is the basis of government, and as the state is secure in proportion as the people are attached to its institutions, it is therefore, says Mr Southey, the first rule of policy, that the government should train the people in the way in which they should go; and it is plain, that those who train them in any other way, are undermining the state.

Now it does not appear to us to be the first object that people should always believe in the established religion, and be attached to the established government. A religion may be false. A government may be oppressive. And whatever support government gives to false religions, or religion to oppressive governments, we consider as a clear evil.

The maxim, that governments ought to train the people in the

way in which they should go, sounds well. But is there any reason for believing that a government is more likely to lead the people in the right way, than the people to fall into the right way of themselves? Have there not been governments which were blind leaders of the blind? Are there not still such governments? Can it be laid down as a general rule that the movement of political and religious truth is rather downwards from the government to the people, than upwards from the people to the government? These are questions which it is of importance to have clearly resolved. Mr Southey declaims against public opinion, which is now, he tells us, usurping supreme power. Formerly, according to him, the laws governed; now public opinion governs. What are laws but expressions of the opinion of some class which has power over the rest of the community? By what was the world ever governed, but by the opinion of some person or persons? By what else can it ever be governed? What are all systems, religious, political, or scientific, but opinions resting on evidence more or less satisfactory? The question is not between human opinion, and some higher and more certain mode of arriving at truth, but between opinion and opinion,—between the opinion of one man and another, or of one class and another, or of one generation and another. Public opinion is not infallible; but can Mr Southey construct any institutions which shall secure to us the guidance of an infallible opinion? Can Mr Southey select any family,—any profession—any class, in short, distinguished by any plain badge from the rest of the community, whose opinion is more likely to be just than this much-abused public opinion? Would he choose the peers, for example? Or the two hundred tallest men in the country? Or the poor Knights of Windsor? Or children who are born with cawls, seventh sons of seventh sons? We cannot suppose that he would recommend popular election; for that is merely an appeal to public opinion. And to say that society ought to be governed by the opinion of the wisest and best, though true, is useless. Whose opinion is to decide, who are the wisest and best?

Mr Southey and many other respectable people seem to think that when they have once proved the moral and religious training of the people to be a most important object, it follows, of course, that it is an object which the government ought to pursue. They forget that we have to consider, not merely the goodness of the end, but also the fitness of the means. Neither in the natural nor in the political body have all members the same office. There is surely no contradiction in saying that a certain section of the community may be quite competent to

protect the persons and property of the rest, yet quite unfit to direct our opinions, or to superintend our private habits.

So strong is the interest of a ruler, to protect his subjects against all depredations and outrages except his own,—so clear and simple are the means by which this end is to be effected, that men are probably better off under the worst governments in the world, than they would be in a state of anarchy. Even when the appointment of magistrates has been left to chance, as in the Italian Republics, things have gone on better than they would have done, if there had been no magistrates at all, and every man had done what seemed right in his own eyes. But we see no reason for thinking that the opinions of the magistrate are more likely to be right than those of any other man. None of the modes by which rulers are appointed,—popular election, the accident of the lot, or the accident of birth,—afford, as far as we can perceive, much security for their being wiser than any of their neighbours. The chance of their being wiser than all their neighbours together is still smaller. Now we cannot conceive how it can be laid down, that it is the duty and the right of one class to direct the opinions of another, unless it can be proved that the former class is more likely to form just opinions than the latter.

The duties of government would be, as Mr Southey says that they are, paternal, if a government were necessarily as much superior in wisdom to a people, as the most foolish father, for a time, is to the most intelligent child, and if a government loved a people as fathers generally love their children. But there is no reason to believe, that a government will either have the paternal warmth of affection or the paternal superiority of intellect. Mr Southey might as well say, that the duties of the shoemaker are paternal, and that it is an usurpation in any man not of the craft to say that his shoes are bad, and to insist on having better. The division of labour would be no blessing, if those by whom a thing is done were to pay no attention to the opinion of those for whom it is done. The shoemaker, in the *Relapse*, tells Lord Poppington, that his lordship is mistaken in supposing that his shoe pinches. 'It does not pinch—it cannot pinch—I know my business—and I never made a better shoe.' This is the way in which Mr Southey would have a government treat a people who usurp the privilege of thinking. Nay, the shoemaker of Vanburgh has the advantage in the comparison. He contented himself with regulating his customer's shoes, about which he knew something, and did not presume to dictate about the coat and hat. But Mr Southey would have the rulers of a country prescribe opinions to the people, not only about politics,

but about matters concerning which a government has no peculiar sources of information,—concerning which any man in the streets may know as much, and think as justly, as a king,—religion and morals.

Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly, as when they discuss it freely. A government can interfere in discussion, only by making it less free than it would otherwise be. Men are most likely to form just opinions, when they have no other wish than to know the truth, and are exempt from all influence, either of hope or fear. Government, as government, can bring nothing but the influence of hopes and fears to support its doctrines. It carries on controversy, not with reasons, but with threats and bribes. If it employs reasons, it does so not in virtue of any powers which belong to it as a government. Thus, instead of a contest between argument and argument, we have a contest between argument and force. Instead of a contest in which truth, from the natural constitution of the human mind, has a decided advantage over falsehood, we have a contest, in which truth can be victorious only by accident.

And what, after all, is the security which this training gives to governments? Mr Southey would scarcely recommend, that discussion should be more effectually shackled, that public opinion should be more strictly disciplined into conformity with established institutions, than in Spain and Italy. Yet we know that the restraints which exist in Spain and Italy have not prevented atheism from spreading among the educated classes, and especially among those whose office it is to minister at the altars of God. All our readers know how, at the time of the French Revolution, priest after priest came forward to declare that his doctrine, his ministry, his whole life, had been a lie,—a mummery during which he could scarcely compose his countenance sufficiently to carry on the imposture. This was the case of a false, or at least a grossly corrupted religion. Let us take, then, the case of all others the most favourable to Mr Southey's argument. Let us take that form of religion, which he holds to be the purest, the system of the Arminian part of the Church of England. Let us take the form of government which he most admires and regrets, the government of England in the time of Charles the First. Would he wish to see a closer connexion between church and state than then existed? Would he wish for more powerful ecclesiastical tribunals? for a more zealous king? for a more active primate? Would he wish to see a more complete monopoly of public instruction given to the Established Church? Could any government do more to train the people in the way in which he would have them go? And in what did all this training end? The



Report of the State of the Province of Canterbury, delivered by Laud to his Master at the close of 1639, represents the Church of England as in the highest and most palmy state. So effectually had the government pursued that policy which Mr Southey wishes to see revived, that there was scarcely the least appearance of dissent. Most of the bishops stated that all was well among their flocks. Seven or eight persons in the diocese of Peterborough had seemed refractory to the church, but had made ample submission. In Norfolk and Suffolk all whom there had been reason to suspect had made profession of conformity, and appeared to observe it strictly. It is confessed that there was a little difficulty in bringing some of the vulgar in Suffolk to take the sacrament at the rails in the chancel. This was the only open instance of non-conformity which the vigilant eye of Laud could find in all the dioceses of his twenty-one suffragans, on the very eve of a revolution, in which primate and church, and monarch and monarchy, were to perish together.

At which time would Mr Southey pronounce the constitution more secure; in 1639, when Laud presented this Report to Charles, or now, when thousands of meetings openly collect millions of dissenters, when designs against the tithes are openly avowed, when books attacking not only the Establishment, but the first principles of Christianity, are openly sold in the streets? The signs of discontent, he tells us, are stronger in England now than in France when the States-General met; and hence he would have us infer that a revolution like that of France may be at hand. Does he not know that the danger of states is to be estimated, not by what breaks out of the public mind, but by what stays in it? Can he conceive any thing more terrible than the situation of a government which rules without apprehension over a people of hypocrites,—which is flattered by the press, and cursed in the inner chambers—which exults in the attachment and obedience of its subjects, and knows not that those subjects are leagued against it in a free-masonry of hatred, the sign of which is every day conveyed in the glance of ten thousand eyes, the pressure of ten thousand hands, and the tone of ten thousand voices? Profound and ingenious policy! Instead of curing the disease, to remove those symptoms by which alone its nature can be known! To leave the serpent his deadly sting, and deprive him only of his warning rattle!

When the people whom Charles had so assiduously trained in the good way had rewarded his paternal care by cutting off his head, a new kind of training came into fashion. Another government arose, which, like the former, considered religion as its surest basis, and the religious discipline of the people as its

first duty. Sanguinary laws were enacted against libertinism; profane pictures were burned; drapery was put on indecorous statues; the theatres were shut up; fast-days were numerous; and the Parliament resolved that no person should be admitted into any public employment, unless the House should be first satisfied of his vital godliness. We know what was the end of this training. We know that it ended in impiety, in filthy and heartless sensuality, in the dissolution of all ties of honour and morality. We know that at this very day scriptural phrases, scriptural names, perhaps some scriptural doctrines, excite disgust and ridicule, solely because they are associated with the austerity of that period.

Thus has the experiment of training the people in established forms of religion been twice tried in England on a large scale; once by Charles and Laud, and once by the Puritans. The High Tories of our time still entertain many of the feelings and opinions of Charles and Laud, though in a mitigated form; nor is it difficult to see that the heirs of the Puritans are still amongst us. It would be desirable that each of these parties should remember how little advantage or honour it formerly derived from the closest alliance with power,—that it fell by the support of rulers, and rose by their opposition,—that of the two systems, that in which the people were at any time being drilled, was always at that time the unpopular system,—that the training of the High Church ended in the reign of the Puritans, and the training of the Puritans in the reign of the harlots.

This was quite natural. Nothing is so galling and detestable to a people not broken in from the birth, as a paternal, or, in other words, a meddling government,—a government which tells them what to read, and say, and eat, and drink, and wear. Our fathers could not bear it two hundred years ago; and we are not more patient than they. Mr Southey thinks that the yoke of the church is dropping off, because it is loose. We feel convinced that it is borne only because it is easy, and that, in the instant in which an attempt is made to tighten it, it will be flung away. It will be neither the first nor the strongest yoke that has been broken asunder and trampled under foot in the day of the vengeance of England.

How far Mr Southey would have the government carry its measures for training the people in the doctrines of the church, we are unable to discover. In one passage Sir Thomas More asks with great vehemence,

‘Is it possible that your laws should suffer the unbelievers to exist as a party?’

‘*Vetitum est adeo sceleris nihil?*’

Montesinos answers. 'They avow themselves in defiance of the laws. The fashionable doctrine which the press at this time maintains is, that this is a matter in which the laws ought not to interfere, every man having a right, both to form what opinion he pleases upon religious subjects, and to promulgate that opinion.'

It is clear, therefore, that Mr Southey would not give full and perfect toleration to infidelity. In another passage, however, he observes, with some truth, though too sweepingly, that 'any degree of intolerance short of that full extent which the Papal Church exercises where it has the power, acts upon the opinions which it is intended to suppress, like pruning upon vigorous plants; they grow the stronger for it.' These two passages, put together, would lead us to the conclusion that, in Mr Southey's opinion, the utmost severity ever employed by the Roman Catholic Church in the days of its greatest power ought to be employed against unbelievers in England; in plain words, that Carlile and his shopmen ought to be burned in Smithfield, and that every person who, when called upon, should decline to make a solemn profession of Christianity, ought to suffer the same fate. We do not, however, believe that Mr Southey would recommend such a course, though his language would, in the case of any other writer, justify us in supposing this to be his meaning. His opinions form no system at all. He never sees, at one glance, more of a question than will furnish matter for one flowing and well-turned sentence; so that it would be the height of unfairness to charge him personally with holding a doctrine, merely because that doctrine is deducible, though by the closest and most accurate reasoning, from the premises which he has laid down. We are, therefore, left completely in the dark as to Mr Southey's opinions about toleration. Immediately after censuring the government for not punishing infidels, he proceeds to discuss the question of the Catholic disabilities—now, thank God, removed—and defends them on the ground that the Catholic doctrines tend to persecution, and that the Catholics persecuted when they had power.

'They must persecute,' says he, 'if they believe their own creed, for conscience-sake; and if they do not believe it, they must persecute for policy; because it is only by intolerance that so corrupt and injurious a system can be upheld.'

That unbelievers should not be persecuted, is an instance of national depravity at which the glorified spirits stand aghast. Yet a sect of Christians is to be excluded from power, because those who formerly held the same opinions were guilty of persecution. We have said that we do not very well know what Mr

Southey's opinion about toleration is. But, on the whole, we take it to be this, that everybody is to tolerate him, and that he is to tolerate nobody.

We will not be deterred by any fear of misrepresentation from expressing our hearty approbation of the mild, wise, and eminently Christian manner, in which the Church and the Government have lately acted with respect to blasphemous publications. We praise them for not having thought it necessary to encircle a religion pure, merciful, and philosophical,—a religion to the evidences of which the highest intellects have yielded,—with the defences of a false and bloody superstition. The ark of God was never taken till it was surrounded by the arms of earthly defenders. In captivity, its sanctity was sufficient to vindicate it from insult, and to lay the hostile fiend prostrate on the threshold of his own temple. The real security of Christianity is to be found in its benevolent morality, in its exquisite adaptation to the human heart, in the facility with which its scheme accommodates itself to the capacity of every human intellect, in the consolation which it bears to the house of mourning, in the light with which it brightens the great mystery of the grave. To such a system it can bring no addition of dignity or of strength, that it is part and parcel of the common law. It is not now for the first time left to rely on the force of its own evidences, and the attractions of its own beauty. Its sublime theology confounded the Grecian schools in the fair conflict of reason with reason. The bravest and wisest of the Cæsars found their arms and their policy unavailing when opposed to the weapons that were not carnal, and the kingdom that was not of this world. The victory which Porphyry and Diocletian failed to gain, is not, to all appearance, reserved for any of those who have in this age directed their attacks against the last restraint of the powerful, and the last hope of the wretched. The whole history of the Christian Religion shows, that she is in far greater danger of being corrupted by the alliance of power, than of being crushed by its opposition. Those who thrust temporal sovereignty upon her, treat her as their prototypes treated her author. They bow the knee, and spit upon her; they cry Hail! and smite her on the cheek; they put a sceptre into her hand, but it is a fragile reed; they crown her, but it is with thorns; they cover with purple the wounds which their own hands have inflicted on her; and inscribe magnificent titles over the cross on which they have fixed her to perish in ignominy and pain.

The general view which Mr Southey takes of the prospects of society is very gloomy; but we comfort ourselves with the consideration that Mr Southey is no prophet. He foretold, we re-

member, on the very eve of the abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts, that these hateful laws were immortal, and that pious minds would long be gratified by seeing the most solemn religious rite of the Church profaned, for the purpose of upholding her political supremacy. In the book before us, he says that Catholics cannot possibly be admitted into Parliament until those whom Johnson called 'the bottomless Whigs,' come into power. While the book was in the press, the prophecy was falsified, and a Tory of the Tories, Mr Southey's own favourite hero, won and wore that noblest wreath, '*Ob civis servatos.*'

The signs of the times, Mr Southey tells us, are very threatening. His fears for the country would decidedly preponderate over his hopes, but for his firm reliance on the mercy of God. Now, as we know that God has once suffered the civilised world to be overrun by savages, and the Christian religion to be corrupted by doctrines which made it, for some ages, almost as bad as Paganism, we cannot think it inconsistent with his attributes that similar calamities should again befall mankind.

We look, however, on the state of the world, and of this kingdom in particular, with much greater satisfaction, and with better hopes. Mr Southey speaks with contempt of those who think the savage state happier than the social. On this subject, he says, Rousseau never imposed on him even in his youth. But he conceives that a community which has advanced a little way in civilisation is happier than one which has made greater progress. The Britons in the time of Cæsar were happier, he suspects, than the English of the nineteenth century. On the whole, he selects the generation which preceded the Reformation as that in which the people of this country were better off than at any time before or since.

This opinion rests on nothing, as far as we can see, except his own individual associations. He is a man of letters; and a life destitute of literary pleasures seems insipid to him. He abhors the spirit of the present generation, the severity of its studies, the boldness of its enquiries, and the disdain with which it regards some old prejudices by which his own mind is held in bondage. He dislikes an utterly unenlightened age; he dislikes an investigating and reforming age. The first twenty years of the sixteenth century would have exactly suited him. They furnished just the quantity of intellectual excitement which he requires. The learned few read and wrote largely. A scholar was held in high estimation; but the rabble did not presume to think; and even the most enquiring and independent of the educated classes paid more reverence to authority, and less to reason, than is usual in our time. This is a state of things in which Mr

Southey would have found himself quite comfortable ; and, accordingly, he pronounces it the happiest state of things ever known in the world.

The savages were wretched, says Mr Southey ; but the people in the time of Sir Thomas More were happier than either they or we. Now, we think it quite certain that we have the advantage over the contemporaries of Sir Thomas More, in every point in which they had any advantage over savages.

Mr Southey does not even pretend to maintain that the people in the sixteenth century were better lodged or clothed than at present. He seems to admit that in these respects there has been some little improvement. It is indeed a matter about which scarcely any doubt can exist in the most perverse mind, that the improvements of machinery have lowered the price of manufactured articles, and have brought within the reach of the poorest some conveniencies which Sir Thomas More or his master could not have obtained at any price.

The labouring classes, however, were, according to Mr Southey, better fed three hundred years ago than at present. We believe that he is completely in error on this point. The condition of servants in noble and wealthy families, and of scholars at the Universities, must surely have been better in those times than that of common day-labourers ; and we are sure that it was not better than that of our workhouse paupers. From the household book of the Northumberland family, we find that in one of the greatest establishments of the kingdom the servants lived almost entirely on salt meat, without any bread at all. A more unwholesome diet can scarcely be conceived. In the reign of Edward the Sixth, the state of the students at Cambridge is described to us, on the very best authority, as most wretched. Many of them dined on pottage made of a farthing's worth of beef with a little salt and oatmeal, and literally nothing else. This account we have from a contemporary master of St Johns. Our parish poor now eat wheaten bread. In the sixteenth century the labourer was glad to get barley, and was often forced to content himself with poorer fare. In Harrison's introduction to Holinshed we have an account of the state of our working population in the 'golden days,' as Mr Southey calls them, of good Queen Bess. 'The gentilitie,' says he, 'commonly provide themselves sufficiently of wheat for their own tables, whylest their household and poore neighbours in some shires are inforced to content themselves with rice or barleie ; yea, and in time of dearth, many with bread made eyther of beanes, peason, or otes, or of altogether, and some acornes among. I will not say that this extremity is oft so well to be seen in time of plentie as of

'dearth; but if I should I could easily bring my trial: for albeit there be much more grounde eared nowe almost in everye place then hath beene of late yeares, yet such a price of corne continueth in eache towne and markete, without any just cause, that the artificer and poore labouring man is not able to reach unto it, but is driven to content himself with horse-corne; I mean beanes, peason, otes, tares, and lintelles.' We should like to see what the effect would be of putting any parish in England now on allowance of 'horse-corne.' The helotry of Mammon are not, in our day, so easily enforced to content themselves as the peasantry of that happy period, as Mr Southey considers it, which elapsed between the fall of the feudal and the rise of the commercial tyranny.

'The people,' says Mr Southey, 'are worse fed than when they were fishers.' And yet in another place he complains that they will not eat fish. 'They have contracted,' says he, 'I know not how, some obstinate prejudice against a kind of food at once wholesome and delicate, and everywhere to be obtained cheaply and in abundance, were the demand for it as general as it ought to be.' It is true that the lower orders have an obstinate prejudice against fish. But hunger has no such obstinate prejudices. If what was formerly a common diet is now eaten only in times of severe pressure, the inference is plain. The people must be fed with what they at least think better food than that of their ancestors.

The advice and medicine which the poorest labourer can now obtain, in disease or after an accident, is far superior to what Henry the Eighth could have commanded. Scarcely any part of the country is out of the reach of practitioners, who are probably not so far inferior to Sir Henry Hallford as they are superior to Sir Anthony Denny. That there has been a great improvement in this respect Mr Southey allows. Indeed he could not well have denied it. 'But,' says he, 'the evils for which these sciences are the palliative, have increased since the time of the Druids, in a proportion that heavily overweighs the benefit of improved therapeutics.' We know nothing either of the diseases or the remedies of the Druids. But we are quite sure that the improvement of medicine has far more than kept pace with the increase of disease during the last three centuries. This is proved by the best possible evidence. The term of human life is decidedly longer in England than in any former age, respecting which we possess any information on which we can rely. All the rants in the world about picturesque cottages and temples of Mammon will not shake this argument. No test of the state of society can be named so decisive as that which is

furnished by bills of mortality. That the lives of the people of this country have been gradually lengthening during the course of several generations, is as certain as any fact in statistics, and that the lives of men should become longer and longer, while their physical condition, during life, is becoming worse and worse, is utterly incredible.

Let our readers think over these circumstances. Let them take into the account the sweating sickness and the plague. Let them take into the account that fearful disease which first made its appearance in the generation to which Mr Southey assigns the palm of felicity, and raged through Europe with a fury at which the physician stood aghast, and before which the people were swept away by thousands. Let them consider the state of the northern counties, constantly the scene of robberies, rapes, massacres, and conflagrations. Let them add to all this the fact that seventy-two thousand persons suffered death by the hands of the executioner during the reign of Henry the Eighth, and judge between the nineteenth and the sixteenth century.

We do not say that the lower orders in England do not suffer severe hardships. But, in spite of Mr Southey's assertions, and in spite of the assertions of a class of politicians, who, differing from Mr Southey in every other point, agree with him in this, we are inclined to doubt whether they really suffer greater physical distress than the labouring classes of the most flourishing countries of the Continent.

It will scarcely be maintained that the lazzaroni who sleep under the porticos of Naples, or the beggars who besiege the convents of Spain, are in a happier situation than the English commonalty. The distress which has lately been experienced in the northern part of Germany, one of the best governed and most prosperous districts of Europe, surpasses, if we have been correctly informed, any thing which has of late years been known among us. In Norway and Sweden the peasantry are constantly compelled to mix bark with their bread, and even this expedient has not always preserved whole families and neighbourhoods from perishing together of famine. An experiment has lately been tried in the kingdom of the Netherlands, which has been cited to prove the possibility of establishing agricultural colonies on the waste-lands of England; but which proves to our minds nothing so clearly as this, that the rate of subsistence to which the labouring classes are reduced in the Netherlands is miserably low, and very far inferior to that of the English paupers. No distress which the people here have endured for centuries, approaches to that which has been felt by the French in our own time. The beginning of the year 1817, was



a time of great distress in this island. But the state of the lowest classes here was luxury compared with that of the people of France. We find in Magendie's *Journal de Physiologie Experimentale*, a paper on a point of physiology connected with the distress of that season. It appears that the inhabitants of six departments, Aix, Jura, Doubs, Haute Saone, Vosges, and Saone et Loire, were reduced first to oatmeal and potatoes, and at last to nettles, bean-stalks, and other kinds of herbage fit only for cattle; that when the next harvest enabled them to eat barley-bread, many of them died from intemperate indulgence in what they thought an exquisite repast; and that a dropsy of a peculiar description was produced by the hard fare of the year. Dead bodies were found on the roads and in the fields. A single surgeon dissected six of these, and found the stomach shrunk, and filled with the unwholesome aliments which hunger had driven men to share with beasts. Such extremity of distress as this is never heard of in England, or even in Ireland. We are, on the whole, inclined to think, though we would speak with diffidence on a point on which it would be rash to pronounce a positive judgment without a much longer and closer investigation than we have bestowed upon it, that the labouring classes of this island, though they have their grievances and distresses, some produced by their own improvidence, some by the errors of their rulers, are on the whole better off as to physical comforts, than the inhabitants of any equally extensive district of the old world. On this very account, suffering is more acutely felt and more loudly bewailed here than elsewhere. We must take into the account the liberty of discussion, and the strong interest which the opponents of a ministry always have to exaggerate the extent of the public disasters. There are many parts of Europe in which the people quietly endure distress that here would shake the foundations of the state,—in which the inhabitants of a whole province turn out to eat grass with less clamour than one Spitalfields weaver would make here, if the overseers were to put him on barley-bread. In those new countries in which a civilized population has at its command a boundless extent of the richest soil, the condition of the labourer is probably happier than in any society which has lasted for many centuries. But in the old world we must confess ourselves unable to find any satisfactory record of any great nation, past or present, in which the working classes have been in a more comfortable situation than in England during the last thirty years. When this island was thinly peopled, it was barbarous. There was little capital; and that little was insecure. It is now the richest and the most highly civilized spot in the world; but the population is dense. Thus

we have never known that golden age, which the lower orders in the United States are now enjoying. We have never known an age of liberty, of order, and of education, an age in which the mechanical sciences were carried to a great height, yet in which the people were not sufficiently numerous to cultivate even the most fertile valleys. But, when we compare our own condition with that of our ancestors, we think it clear that the advantages arising from the progress of civilisation have far more than counterbalanced the disadvantages arising from the progress of population. While our numbers have increased tenfold, our wealth has increased a hundred fold. Though there are so many more people to share the wealth now existing in the country than there were in the sixteenth century, it seems certain, that a greater share falls to almost every individual, than fell to the share of any of the corresponding class in the sixteenth century. The King keeps a more splendid court. The establishments of the nobles are more magnificent. The esquires are richer, the merchants are richer, the shopkeepers are richer. The serving-man, the artisan, and the husbandman, have a more copious and palatable supply of food, better clothing, and better furniture. This is no reason for tolerating abuses, or for neglecting any means of ameliorating the condition of our poorer countrymen. But it is a reason against telling them, as some of our philosophers are constantly telling them, that they are the most wretched people who ever existed on the face of the earth.

We have already adverted to Mr Southey's amusing doctrine about national wealth. A state, says he, cannot be too rich; but a people may be too rich. His reason for thinking this, is extremely curious.

‘A people may be too rich, because it is the tendency of the commercial, and more especially, of the manufacturing system, to collect wealth rather than to diffuse it. Where wealth is necessarily employed in any of the speculations of trade, its increase is in proportion to its amount. Great capitalists become like pikes in a fish-pond, who devour the weaker fish; and it is but too certain, that the poverty of one part of the people seems to increase in the same ratio as the riches of another. There are examples of this in history. In Portugal, when the high tide of wealth flowed in from the conquests in Africa and the East, the effect of that great influx was not more visible in the augmented splendour of the court, and the luxury of the higher ranks, than in the distress of the people.’

Mr Southey's instance is not a very fortunate one. The wealth which did so little for the Portuguese was not the fruit, either of manufactures or of commerce carried on by private individuals. It was the wealth, not of the people, but of the government and its creatures, of those who, as Mr Southey thinks, can

never be too rich. The fact is, that Mr Southey's proposition is opposed to all history, and to the phenomena which surround us on every side. England is the richest country in Europe, the most commercial, and the most manufacturing. Russia and Poland are the poorest countries in Europe. They have scarcely any trade, and none but the rudest manufactures. Is wealth more diffused in Russia and Poland than in England? There are individuals in Russia and Poland, whose incomes are probably equal to those of our richest countrymen. It may be doubted, whether there are not, in those countries, as many fortunes of eighty thousand a-year, as here. But are there as many fortunes of five thousand a-year, or of one thousand a-year? There are parishes in England, which contain more people of between five hundred and three thousand pounds a-year, than could be found in all the dominions of the Emperor Nicholas. The neat and commodious houses which have been built in London and its vicinity, for people of this class, within the last thirty years, would of themselves form a city larger than the capitals of some European kingdoms. And this is the state of society in which the great proprietors have devoured the smaller!

The cure which Mr Southey thinks that he has discovered is worthy of the sagacity which he has shown in detecting the evil. The calamities arising from the collection of wealth in the hands of a few capitalists are to be remedied by collecting it in the hands of one great capitalist, who has no conceivable motive to use it better than other capitalists,—the all-devouring state.

It is not strange that, differing so widely from Mr Southey as to the past progress of society, we should differ from him also as to its probable destiny. He thinks, that to all outward appearance, the country is hastening to destruction; but he relies firmly on the goodness of God. We do not see either the piety, or the rationality, of thus confidently expecting that the Supreme Being will interfere to disturb the common succession of causes and effects. We, too, rely on his goodness,—on his goodness as manifested, not in extraordinary interpositions, but in those general laws which it has pleased him to establish in the physical and in the moral world. We rely on the natural tendency of the human intellect to truth, and on the natural tendency of society to improvement. We know no well-authenticated instance of a people which has decidedly retrograded in civilisation and prosperity, except from the influence of violent and terrible calamities,—such as those which laid the Roman Empire in ruins, or those which, about the beginning of the six-

teenth century, desolated Italy. We know of no country which, at the end of fifty years of peace and tolerably good government, has been less prosperous than at the beginning of that period. The political importance of a state may decline, as the balance of power is disturbed by the introduction of new forces. Thus the influence of Holland and of Spain is much diminished. But are Holland and Spain poorer than formerly? We doubt it. Other countries have outrun them. But we suspect that they have been positively, though not relatively, advancing. We suspect that Holland is richer than when she sent her navies up the Thames,—that Spain is richer than when a French king was brought captive to the footstool of Charles the Fifth.

History is full of the signs of this natural progress of society. We see in almost every part of the annals of mankind how the industry of individuals, struggling up against wars, taxes, famines, conflagrations, mischievous prohibitions, and more mischievous protections, creates faster than governments can squander, and repairs whatever invaders can destroy. We see the capital of nations increasing, and all the arts of life approaching nearer and nearer to perfection, in spite of the grossest corruption and the wildest profusion on the part of rulers.

The present moment is one of great distress. But how small will that distress appear when we think over the history of the last forty years;—a war, compared with which, all other wars sink into insignificance;—taxation, such as the most heavily taxed people of former times could not have conceived;—a debt larger than all the public debts that ever existed in the world added together;—the food of the people studiously rendered dear;—the currency imprudently debased, and imprudently restored. Yet is the country poorer than in 1790? We fully believe that, in spite of all the misgovernment of her rulers, she has been almost constantly becoming richer and richer. Now and then there has been a stoppage, now and then a short retrogression; but as to the general tendency there can be no doubt. A single breaker may recede, but the tide is evidently coming in.

If we were to prophesy that in the year 1930, a population of fifty millions, better fed, clad, and lodged than the English of our time, will cover these islands,—that Sussex and Huntingdonshire will be wealthier than the wealthiest parts of the West-Riding of Yorkshire now are,—that cultivation, rich as that of a flower-garden, will be carried up to the very tops of Ben Nevis and Helvellyn,—that machines, constructed on principles yet undiscovered, will be in every house,—that there will be no high-ways but rail-roads, no travelling but by steam,—that our debt,

vast as it seems to us, will appear to our great-grandchildren a trifling encumbrance, which might easily be paid off in a year or two,—many people would think us insane. We prophesy nothing; but this we say—If any person had told the Parliament which met in perplexity and terror after the crash in 1720, that in 1830 the wealth of England would surpass all their wildest dreams—that the annual revenue would equal the principal of that debt which they considered as an intolerable burden—that for one man of L.10,000 then living, there would be five men of L.50,000; that London would be twice as large and twice as populous, and that nevertheless the mortality would have diminished to one-half what it then was,—that the post-office would bring more into the exchequer than the excise and customs had brought in together under Charles II,—that stage-coaches would run from London to York in twenty-four hours—that men would sail without wind, and would be beginning to ride without horses—our ancestors would have given as much credit to the prediction as they gave to Gulliver's Travels. Yet the prediction would have been true; and they would have perceived that it was not altogether absurd, if they had considered that the country was then raising every year a sum which would have purchased the fee-simple of the revenue of the Plantagenets—ten times what supported the government of Elizabeth—three times what, in the time of Oliver Cromwell, had been thought intolerably oppressive. To almost all men the state of things under which they have been used to live seems to be the necessary state of things. We have heard it said, that five per cent is the natural interest of money, that twelve is the natural number of a jury, that forty shillings is the natural qualification of a county voter. Hence it is, that though, in every age, every body knows that up to his own time progressive improvement has been taking place, nobody seems to reckon on any improvement during the next generation. We cannot absolutely prove that those are in error who tell us that society has reached a turning point—that we have seen our best days. But so said all who came before us, and with just as much apparent reason. 'A million a-year will beggar us,' said the patriots of 1640. 'Two millions a-year will grind the country to powder,' was the cry in 1660. 'Six millions a-year, and a debt of fifty millions!' exclaimed Swift—'the high allies have been the ruin of us.' 'A hundred and forty millions of debt!' said Junius—'well may we say that we owe Lord Chatham more than we shall ever pay, if we owe him such a load as this.' 'Two hundred and forty millions of debt!' cried all the statesmen of 1783 in chorus—'what abilities, or what economy on the part

‘of a minister, can save a country so burdened?’ We know that if, since 1783, no fresh debt had been incurred, the increased resources of the country would have enabled us to defray that burden, at which Pitt, Fox, and Burke stood aghast—to defray it over and over again, and that with much lighter taxation than what we have actually borne. On what principle is it, that when we see nothing but improvement behind us, we are to expect nothing but deterioration before us?

It is not by the intermeddling of Mr Southey’s idol—the omniscient and omnipotent State—but by the prudence and energy of the people, that England has hitherto been carried forward in civilisation; and it is to the same prudence and the same energy that we now look with comfort and good hope. Our rulers will best promote the improvement of the people by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties—by leaving capital to find its most lucrative course, commodities their fair price, industry and intelligence their natural reward, idleness and folly their natural punishment—by maintaining peace, by defending property, by diminishing the price of law, and by observing strict economy in every department of the state. Let the Government do this—the People will assuredly do the rest.

*No. CI. will be published in April.*



## INDEX.

## A

- AGATHIAS*, the Byzantine historian, character of his writings, 90.  
*American Literature*—Irving, 126—Brown, *ib.*—Cooper, 128.—Franklin, 130.—Author of the American Farmer's Letters, *ib.*—Edwards, 131.—Channing, 131–132.  
*Andes*, the loftiest peaks of, measured by Mr Pentland, 365.  
*Angelo, Michael*, account of his statues, 254.  
*Anna Comnena*, character of her *Alexiad*, 96.  
*Arabia*, why divided into the Desert, Stony, and Happy, 165.  
*Atomic Theory*, by whom projected, and successfully prosecuted, 267–273.  
*Auldjo's* ascent to the summit of Mont Blanc, 221—dangers attending the journey, 222—the folly of such attempts, 222–223—merits of the present narrative, 225—description of the Grands Mulôts, quoted, *ib.*—of a bridge of snow, 227—peril of one of the guides, *ib.*—lively picture of the state he was in on reaching the summit, 228–229—perilous situation in descending, 230.

## B

- Balguy's* Divine benevolence asserted, quoted, 306.  
*Beet-root*, rapid progress of the manufacture of, into sugar, in France, 59–60:  
*Bentham, Jeremy*, his meaning misunderstood by the Utilitarians, 119.  
*Bonaparte*, his commercial policy, 50—extract from Channing's analysis of his character, 143.  
*Botany*, what it embraces, 145.  
*Brown*, the American novelist, his character as a writer, 126–127.  
*Burckhardt's Travels* in Arabia, 164—his qualifications as a traveller, *ib.*—completeness of his account of Mecca, 168—curious view of the course of mercantile transactions in Arabia, *ib.*—account of Jidda, *ib.*—interview with Mohammed Ali, 169—account of Mecca, 171—the great Mosque, 172—curious superstition respecting, *ib.*—sacred object enclosed there, 173—visit of pilgrims to the Mount of Arafat, 174—account of the Meccaways, 176—extinction of knowledge at Mecca, 178—account of Medina, 179—and Yambo, 180.  
*Butler, Bishop*, why his sermons have fallen into neglect, 138.  
*Butler's Analogy*, quoted on Divine government, 305.  
*Byzantine Historians*, their character, 86–87—period which they embrace, 87—the earliest editions of by Germans, 88—*Agathias*, 90—



Leo Diaconus, period of which he treats, and character, 91—Nicephorus Gregoras, multitude of his writings, 92—quotation from, *ib.*—the ex-emperor, John Cantacuzene, Gibbon's opinion of, 93—his works, 93–94—his remarks on the propagation of the four Gospels, 94—works of the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, 95—Procopius' history, 95–96—Anna Comnena, her *Alexiad*, 96—Laonicus Chalcocondylas, valuable nature of his books, and quotation from, 96—George Phranza's history, 97—Sylvester Syropulus' history, 98—character of the present edition, 99.

## C

*Campbell, Thomas*, poetry of, 47.

*Candole, M. de*, notice of his works on botany, 146.

*Canning*, the late George, anecdote of, 348.

*Catholic Association*, power possessed by, 111.

*Channing, Dr.*, his sermons and tracts, 125—character as a writer, 131—133—extracts from, 133–138, 140–141—want of originality in his notice of Milton, 142—his remarks on Bonaparte, *ib.*—estimate of the treatise, 143—his style, 144.

*Charles I.*, interview of Lady Fanshaw with, 82.

*Charles II.*, atrocities committed during the reign of, 14–15—Cruel conduct of, to Locke, 15.

*Chemistry*, origin of, 256—early proficient in, 258—Boyle, the first experimenter, 259—effects of Dr Black's discoveries, 261—when ranked as an independent science, 262—discoveries respecting heat, 263—retarding effects of Stahl's theory of phlogiston, 264—by whom exploded, 265—effects of this, 266—by whom analyses prosecuted, 266—267—decomposition of the fixed alkalies, and earths, 267—atomic theory, 268–273—present state of the science, 273–276.

*Colony Trade*, effects of prohibitory system on, in France, 57–60.

*Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, character of his history, 94.

*Constantinople*, Mr M'Farlane's work on, 448—number of inhabitants in, 450—conquest of, in the fifteenth century, 352.

*Cotton Trade*, effects of French commercial system on in France, 61–64.

*Cotton*, superiority of England in the manufacture of, 64.

*Cousin, M.*, his course of philosophy, 194—success of his lectures in Paris, *ib.*—fundamental positions of his system, 198—reason constituted of three integrant elements, *ib.*—analogy between the operations of matter and mind, 199—consciousness a complex phenomenon, 200—nature of reflection, 201—in what his doctrine consists, 202—conditions of knowledge, 203—compared with Schelling, 209—the grounds on which his doctrine is based erroneous, 210—his misunderstanding of Aristotle and Kant, 211—mistake on which his theory is founded, 215—origin of the mistake, *ib.*—his theory self-contradictory, 216—his absurd idea of the creative power of the Deity, 219—his attempts to bring about a union among philosophers a failure, 220.

## D

*Dejoe, Daniel*, parentage of, 398—notices of his life, 399—character, 400—his account of the origin of the terms Whig and Tory quoted,

- 403—remarks on the *Exclusion Bill* quoted, 405—on the insults offered James II., after his fall, 406—how introduced to King William, 414—his ‘Shortest way with the Dissenters,’ 415—how treated by the dissenters, 418—in what work he shows a want of candour, 419—notice of his novels, 420–423—letter to his daughter quoted, 424.
- Dempster, Thomas*, notice of his *Etruria Regalis*, 372.
- Denmark*, political aspect of, compared with Rome, 107.
- Donkin, Sir R.*, character of his *Dissertation on the Course of the Niger*, 494—etymological enquiries respecting the terms Nile, Quola, Niger, 495—his remarks on the geographical system of Ptolemy, 490, 500—abstract of his theory of the course of the Niger, 501—incorrectness of, 503.
- Duties, low*, the productiveness of, 433.
- Dutrochet, M.*, notice of his works on Vegetable Physiology, 157.

## E

- Ecclesiastics*, who most celebrated in the last century, 302.<sup>1</sup>
- Edwards, Jonathan*, character of his treatise on the Will, 131.
- Etruscan History and Antiquities*, by whom first accurately examined, 372, 374—notice of Inghirami’s work on, 374—Muller’s work on, 375.
- Etruscans*, origin of, 376—naval exploits of, 381—their manners, 383—their music, *ib.*—sculpture, 384—religion, *ib.*—government, 385—agriculture and commerce, *ib.*—architecture, 389—sepulchres, 390—literature, 393—language, 394.

## F

- Fanshaw, Lady*, *Memoirs* of, 75—compared with those of Mrs Hutchison, 76—character of the work, 76, 77—singular legend respecting her mother, 78—supposed supernatural appearance to, 78, 79—marriage to Sir Richard Fanshaw, 80—instance of their mutual amiableness, 81—privations in the Scilly Islands, 82—interview with Charles I., *ib.*—devoted affection to her husband, 83, 84.
- Fansham, Sir Richard*, faithfulness to his Sovereign, 81.
- Fenelon*, extract from Channing’s treatise on his writings, 135, 138.
- Fitzgerald, Mr.*, his manly conduct during the discussion of the silk question, 74.
- Franklin, Benjamin*, estimate of his character, 130.
- French Commercial System*, the policy of, a matter of rational curiosity, 48—unsuccessful results of, 49, 52—its pernicious effect on the iron trade, 53, 56—on the colony trade, sugar, 57, 60—on the cotton trade, 61, 64—on the linen trade, 64—on the wine trade, 66, 70—on the silk trade, 70—is the cause of her present commercial distress, 72.
- Fichte*, metaphysics of, 197.
- Flaxman’s Lectures on Sculpture*, character of, 231, 232—confusion in his reasoning, 233—his account of the early progress of, in Great Britain quoted, 233, 235—his unfairness to Torregiano, 235—his opinion respecting the progress of sculpture, 237—remarks on Egyptian sculpture quoted, 238—account of Egyptian sculpture, *ib.*—

- false reasoning respecting the effects of science upon sculpture, 239, 242—extract from his lecture on composition, 243—extract from his lecture on Grecian sculpture, 243, 244—his opinions on style, 245—on beauty, 247—Grecian beauty, 249—on the use of ornaments and precious stones in statues, 251, 253—notice of Michael Angelo, 254—description of Pisa, 255.
- Fleece*, the golden, what it was, 256.
- French Ministry*, the new, 277—not formed through the interference of England, 278, 280.
- Forster*, Rev. Mr, his Mahomedanism Unveiled, 329—scheme of the work, 329, 331—his interpretation of the promise that Ismael should become a great nation, 332, 334—remarks on, 335.
- Free Trade*, unreasonableness of the opposers of, 345.
- Frankland*, Captain, notice of his travels to and from Constantinople, 441.

## G

- Gibbon*, Edward, his opinion of the Emperor John Cantacuzene's life, 93.
- Glove Trade*, state of, in England, 74.
- Government*, utilitarian theory of, 99—English a mixed government, 109.
- Greek language*, the effects of its introduction into Italy, 86.

## H

- Hahnemann's Homöopathie*, account of, 504—system of, in supporting his new theory, 506—his fundamental principle, 507—a few of his cases in support of the theory, 508—his view of the nature of disease not new, 516—medicines employed by, 518—opposition to by Dr Sachs and others, 520—cures performed by, 523—remarks on regimen by, 526—reasons adduced by his opponents as explanations of cures wrought by, 527.
- Happiness*, the greatest, *Principle*, mistake of the Westminster Reviewers concerning, 115.
- Heat*, by whom the subject of prosecuted, 262, 263.
- Hemans*, Felicia, her poetry, 32—its charm lies in its tenderness and beautiful imagery, rather than power, 35—a mistress in the art of employing effective imagery, 37—always introduces it for some direct purpose, *ib.*—her Lines on a Palm Tree in an English Garden, *ib.*—'Household Graves,' 38—'Lady of the Castle,' 39—'Joan of Arc in Rheims,' 41—'Epistle of Lady Arabella Stuart,' 43—'An Hour of Romance,' 44—'Girls' School,' 45—'The Lost Pleiad,' 45—'The Dying Improvisatore,' 46—quoted in support of the above position, —character as a poetess, 47.
- Histories*, *Providential and Prophetical*, 287—how the providential may be treated, 292—futility of such writings arising from the inscrutability of Providence, 310, 311, 320.
- Humboldt's Personal Narrative*, notice of, 365.
- Hutchison*, Mrs, her Memoirs compared with those of Lady Fanshaw, 76.

## I

*Ideal*, in sculpture, 250, 251.

*Imagery*, its powerful effect in poetry, 36—employed unconsciously by poets, *ib.*

*Inghirami Francesco*, notice of his work on Etruscan History and Antiquities, 374.

*Iron Trade*, bad condition of in France, 53, 54.

*Irving, Washington*, his merits as a writer, 126.

## J

*Joan, Pope*, remarkable passage respecting, 96.

*Johnson, Dr*, his opinion of Mr Soame Jenyns's inquiry into the nature and origin of evil, 301.

*Justinian*, his two great works, 96.

## K

*Kant*, account of his metaphysics, 197—his services to philosophy, 204, 205—analysis of time and space, *ib.*—errors of his theory, *ib.*—that it leads to scepticism, 106.

*King, Lord*, his Life of John Locke, 1.

*Knight, Henry Gally*, character of his letter addressed to the Earl of Aberdeen, 277.

## L

*Leo Diaconus*, his Byzantine history, 90, 91.

*Linen Trade* in France, effects of French commercial system on, 64, 65.

*Locke, John*, parentage of, 1—letter of, to the Earl of Peterborough, 2—first acquaintance with Shaftesbury, 4, 5—extracts from his Journal of Travels, 6, 7—his opinion of miracles, 11—flies into voluntary exile, 15—is deprived of his fellowship by Charles II, 15—returns to England, 18—refuses a high diplomatic situation in Germany, *ib.*—states his reasons for so doing in a letter to Lord Mordaunt, *ib.*—publishes the Essay on Human Understanding, 19—Correct date of its appearance fixed, *ib.*—it involves him in controversy, *ib.*—takes an active part in political discussions, *ib.*—his remarks on the censorship of the press, 20—becomes acquainted with Newton, *ib.*—correspondence with, 21-24—is appointed to a seat at the Council of Trade, 25—is the principal agent in effecting the great measure of the recoinage, 26—deference paid to his judgment by Lord Somers and Sir Wm. Turnbull, *ib.*—resigns his situation through ill health, 27—his death, *ib.*—estimate of his character as a philosopher and politician, 27, 28—fragment of his on ecclesiastical matters, 30, 31.

## M

*Macfarlane, Charles, Esq.* remarks on his Constantinople in 1828, 448.

*Madden's Travels* in Turkey, Egypt, Nubia, and Palestine, account of, 442—his opinion on the origin of the Copts, 445—of the gipsies, 446.

*Mahommed*, character of his religion, 166, 167.

*Mahomedanism Unveiled*, by the Rev. Mr Forster, 329.

*Marcet, Mrs*, conversations on vegetable physiology, 147.

*Mau's Journal* of a passage from the Pacific to the Atlantic, 363—*as*—

cent to the summit of the Cordillera, 364—reaches Laguna, state of civilisation there, 367—account of the Maranon, 368—of the tribes on its banks, 369.

*Mecca*, difficult to be visited, 167.

*Medina*, account of, 179.

*Medicines*, chemical, the first who prepared them, 257.

*Melaphysics*, progress of, in France, 194, 195.

*Mill, Mr.* sophistry of his reasoning on pain, pleasure, power, 106—his theory of government incomplete, 119.

*Miller, George, D.D.* lectures on the philosophy of modern history, 291—the basis of his system, 293—unsoundness of, 307—remarks on the establishment of the Ottoman government quoted, 324-326—the reasoning inconclusive, 327.

*Miracles*, Locke's remarks on, 11—only used as a proof of a divine mission, 319.

*Moses*, chemical skill of, 257.

*Müller*, Professor, on the origin of the Tuscans, 380—his remarks on the Etruscan language quoted, 395.

## N

*Newton, Sir Isaac*, letters to John Locke, 22—liable to partial aberrations of mind, ib.—letter to John Locke, expressing contrition for mistaking a principle laid down in the *Essay on Understanding*, 24.

*Niger*, dissertation on the course of, 494.

*Nile*, signification of, in Oriental language, 495.

## O

*Ottoman Empire*, conflicting statements respecting, 438—character of the people, 451—its power beyond the Danube never thoroughly established, 454—remarks on the government of Wallachia and Moldavia, 457—former glory and present state compared, 458-461—on the reformation of the Ottomans, 463—power of the Janissaries, ib.—attempts to reform them, 464—final destruction of by Mahmoud, 465—his character, ib. 485—constitution of government, 468—causes of the empire's decay, 469—superstition respecting the house of Othman, 470—power of the Sultan, 474—account of the wealth and power of the Ulemas, 475-485.

*Oxon, Bishop*, base conduct of, to John Locke, 16, 17.

## P

*Paley's Natural Theology* quoted, 303.

*Pecchio, M.*, character of his work on political economy, 356—remarks on his parallel drawn between the political economists of England and Italy, 361.

*Penn, Wm.* Bishop Burnet's opinion of, 18—his rare candour, ib.

*Phidias*, account of his statues, 243, 244.

*Poetry*, in what it consists, 35—indurability of modern poetry, 47—Dr Channing's defence of, 140, 141—Bacon's definition of, 141.

*Political economy*, state of, in Italy, 359.

*Pores* in the vessels of plants, difference of opinion respecting, 149, 150.

*Power*, disquisition on the balance of in states, 103, 111—indefinite meaning of, 107.

*Praxiteles*, account of his statues, 244.

*Prophecy*, *Scripture*, abused by enthusiasts, 289—remarks on, 389.

*Providence*, inscrutibility of, 311.

*Ptolemy*, remarks on his geographical system, 496-500.

## Q

Quarterly List of New Publications, 281, 285.

*Reason*, into what elements divided by Cousin, 198.

*Representation system*, nature of, 110.

*Rogers, Samuel*, character of his poetry, 47.

## S

*Sadler, M. T., Esq. M. P.* the opinions of his school of Political Economy, 344—mischievous nature of his speech at Whitby, 347—leading principles of, 349—reasoning inconclusive, 351.

*Saint Cricq*, bad policy of in France, 66.

*Sap*, on the supply of, to plants, 153, 154.

*Schelling*, his theory respecting the knowledge of the absolute, 207, 209.

*Sculpture*, lectures on, by Flaxman, 231—progress of, in Britain, 233—reflections on the early sculptors, 236—Egyptian sculpture, 238—Grecian sculpture, 243.

*Self-Annihilation*, Channing's remarks on, 135, 138.

*Self-Love*, nature of, 139.

*Shaftesbury, Earl of*, letter to John Locke, 5.

*Silk trade* in France, bad effects of French commercial system on, 70, 71—improvement of, in England, within the last three years, 73.

*Somers, Lord*, letter of, to John Locke, 5.

*Society*, its progressive improvement, 562.

*Southey, Robert, Esq.*, his Colloquies on Society, 528—character of his intellect, 529—his poetry preferable to his prose, 530—his Lives of Nelson and Wesley, ib.—Book of the Church, 531—his political system, 533—plan of the present work, 534, 536—his opinions regarding the manufacturing system erroneous, 558—also on the currency, 541—also on the national debt, 543—specimen of his bad logic, 546—his theory of the basis of government, 547—his remarks on public opinion erroneous, 549—his argument for scouting the Catholic claims stated, 554—and refuted, 554, 555—comparison of the condition of the labouring classes in the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, 557—his argument on national wealth stated and refuted, 561, 562.

*Steam engine*, expense of erecting one in England and France compared, 63.

*Study*, rules laid down for, by Locke, 9, 10.

*Sugar*, remarks on the duty upon, 57, 426—revenue derived from it, 427—table of quantity consumed in Great Britain, 428—its consumption increased by lowering the duty, 429—quantity consumed in Ireland, 431—reduction of the duties on, should be of a general description, 434—quantity of consumed in Great Britain and France in eight years contrasted, 58.

*Spirits*, reduction of the duty on, a wise measure, 486—not the cause of the increase of consumption, *ib.*—effects of a heavy duty being levied on gin in England in 1736, 487—also in Ireland, 489—table showing the effects of a reduction of duty in that country, 490—also in Scotland, 492—gin-drinking not to be put down by heavy duty, 494.

## T

*Turkish Empire*, singular historical tradition respecting the destruction of, by the Russians, 340, 344.

## U

*Useful Knowledge*, Society for the diffusion of, 101—objects of, *ib.*—what it has already accomplished, 182—Library of Useful Knowledge, *ib.*—Library of Entertaining Knowledge, 188—purpose of the Farmer's Series, 105, 188—the horse, 189—reasons urged against the Society answered, 190—extract from the Society's Report, 192.

*Utilitarian theory of Government*, 99—to what Utilitarians owe their influence, *ib.*—their logic unsound, 100—their argument fairly stated, and refuted, 101, 102—error respecting the balance of power in states, 163—fallacy of their reasoning, 104, 105—mistake in the meaning of the word power, 108—and the nature of the English government, 109—not calculated to produce any good results, 117—practical misunderstanding of Mr Bentham, 118, 119—mistake respecting the motives of action, 120—their case not made out, 121—propositions laid down to them, 122, 123.

## V

*Vegetable Physiology*, what it comprehends, 145—how the study of it should be prosecuted, 148—discordant views respecting the structure of the vessels and cells, *ib.*—as also the uses of these, 149—difficulty of determining the question, 150—varieties in the structure of the stems of plants, 151—as also of the seeds, 152—structure and germination of seeds, 152, 153—how vegetables are supplied with sap, 153, 154—of its course, 155—opinions of M. Dutrochet, 157—his hypothesis not new, 162—insufficient for the explanation of phenomena, 163.

## W

*Westminster Review*, on government, 99.

*Whig and Tory*, account of the origin of the terms, 403.

*Wilson's* Life and Times of Daniel Defoe, character of, 397—his character of James II., 408—Whig and Tory, account of origin of, 403.

*Wine*, superiority enjoyed by France in the production of, 66—falling off in the exports of from Bordeaux, 68.

*Women*, their mental constitution, 32—incapable of long and laborious investigations, but eminently adapted for subjects requiring quick tact and fine perception, *ib.*—their sphere, 33—they accomplish their ends more completely than men, *ib.*











